THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

EDITED BY

Alexander Campbell.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come; and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail!

VOL. IV.

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.

1833.

Reprinted by
College Press
Box 1132
Joplin, Missouri 64801

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number I.——Volume IV.

January, 1833.

PREFACE.

TIME, the material of which life is made, never pauses. In its onward current to the ocean of eternity, it carries with it all the busy tribes of men. Our fathers—where are they? and the Prophets—do they live forever? Lord, teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts to wisdom and understanding!

The year *One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty-Three* has arrived. Almost eighteen full centuries are completed since life and incorruptibility arose from the darkness of the grave, in the person of Messiah, to bless a dying world. The Apostacy is in its dotage, and the Man of Sin tottering on the brink of the grave. The world is in travail; a new age is soon to be be born; and the great regeneration is at hand. The parchments, the leagues and covenants that bind the nations in their social and unsocial compacts, are moth-eaten. The foundations of the political mountains and hills are crumbling down to dust; and the imbecilities of all human policies to give to man the knowledge of his rights and the enjoyment of them, are be coming manifest to all. A solemn expectation, an eager longing for some great change, the sure prelude of a mighty system of revolutions, is marked in the pensive countenances of all who think, and believe that the Lord Almighty reigns. Expectation is on tiptoe, stretching forward into the mysterious future, ready to hail with acclamation the harbinger of better times. Jew and Gentile now unite in the anxious anticipation of a great deliverer, whose right to rule the nations none dare dispute.

Our little party jealousies and strifes, our ecclesiastical bickerings and feuds, are all arguments of irresistible demonstration that the Christian profession has, in the long dark night of error, mistook its way, and been jostled off the foundation of God.

The voice of reformation has been lifted up, and the banners of the ancient constitution of Messiah's kingdom have been unfurled. The ancient standard has been dug up out of the ruins of the ages of de-

linquency; but of the immense multitudes who acknowledge its theoretic excellence and practical utility, how few are inspired with that holy spirit of unconditional submission to the authority of the Prime Ministers of Messiah's realm, which distinguished the soldiers of the cross in the days of uncorrupted Christianity.

A remnant has always been found in times of the greatest delinquency; and in the close of the times of the Gentiles we have reason to rejoice, that there is a goodly number of the Gentiles who rally under the testimony of Jesus, and are zealous for his institutions. The theory of reformation is, however, far in advance of the practice, *and to this fact special regard will be had in the volume which we have just commenced.* It is no common thing to be, in the constitutional import of the word, a practical Christian, or rather a Christian in fact. To admire and commend such a one is easy and pleasing to all; but to exhibit and fill up all the outlines of a child of God, a citizen of heaven, and an heir of immortality, is not the result of a wish or a prayer, but of the untiring efforts of an enlightened understanding, and a pure heart, to be conformed to the whole declared will of our Father who is in heaven.

EDITOR.

Self-interpreting Testament.

THE Oracles of God being the light of the world and the life of men, because developing the WORD of God incarnate, dwelling among men—is the Book of Books, and the only book that heaven and earth admire and guard with unbounded jealousy and intense interest. This Book, containing the writings of the Divine Historians, Prophets, Poets, Evangelists, and Apostles, is the work of fifteen centuries. The sacred writings of the Christian Institution are the work of almost one century: at least they include the great incidents of one hundred years from the birth of the Baptist to the death of the beloved John. The New Testament embraces in its contents, and has deeply impressed upon its face, the features and characters of the age which gave it birth. The allusions and direct references to the volume which preceded it, and to the institutions, manners, and customs of the countries in which, and the people among whom, it was first promulged, make a particular acquaintance with these necessary in order to a satisfactory knowledge of its contents. This knowledge is not accessible to all, and therefore the New Testament is not now what it was in the times in which it was written—*a self-interpreting volume.* For the first readers of this book were acquainted with all its notices and references to existing circumstances, with the geography of their own country, and the incidents of their own history, and needed only to read it carefully to understand the whole message of God to them.

The FAMILY TESTAMENT, which we are now completing, and hope to issue during this year, is designed to be a SELF-INTERPRETING

volume. Besides, being a very improved new version, the conjoint labors of men the most learned in languages, ancient history, criticism; containing many emendations in style, in translation; bringing down to the present year from the days of King James, and engrossing the labors of all eminent interpreters, European and American, since that period; will contain *one hundred and sixty pages* of Prefaces, Critical Notes, and Tables Literary, Geographical, Historical, Chronological, Miscellaneous; together with the Maps of the Holy Land and the countries visited by the Apostle to the Gentiles; Explanations of Words and Phrases alluding to ancient manners and customs; as well as the leading Terms and Sentences, subjects of sectarian controversy—will make this volume intelligible to all who diligently peruse it.

The volume will contain more than 600 pages, somewhat larger than the pages of this work, and is printed on paper as fair as this, the text being in a large, clear, and beautiful type; having the verses enumerated for reference on the margin; and will, when substantially bound, be sold at *Two Dollars* per volume. We are able to offer it at this price only because of the size of the edition, and the expectation of being able to sell it at a moderate discount to those who wil be active in distributing it. According to the prices fixed on similar works published in New England, such as Professor Stuart's Translation and Critical Notes on the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, its price would be at least *four dollars a copy.*

The stereotype edition, containing simply the text and about one hundred pages of Prefaces and Miscellaneous matters, in very fine type and on fair paper, plain binding, we hope to be able to sell at 62½ cents per copy. Extra binding, if we can get it done, will be an extra price. But for this we cannot now stipulate.

The Family Testament will, we trust, be found of great assistance to all preachers and teachers of all denominations, and to all persons who wish for that extrinsic information which brings us to live almost in the times of the Apostles, and makes the book what it was at first —*a self-interpreting volume.* The Pocket Testament is designed to be the *pocket companion* of all who love the oracles of the living God.

It will not be satisfactory to all, as indeed it never was in any case, to affirm, that we have felt the awful responsibilities of such an undertaking, and that we are not conscious, before the Judge of all, of having had a single wish to make one passage speak in favor of a single tenet or practice attributed to us. We do not, indeed, doubt that the intelligent reader, who carefully examines this version, will find many passages in it much less favorable to some of the leading tenets ascribed to us, than the common version. When he reads the Epistle to the Romans, if he is not convinced of this, we would despair of convincing him of any proposition to which he is averse.

Our real tenets are just the true meaning of the original Scriptures; and all that we are solicitous for, is to get the true meaning of the words and phrases used by the sacred writers. This, we feel assured, we have done to a greater extent than ever before appeared in any

one version of this book. Our rules of interpretation are those propounded by all the great critics in Europe and America, as recently issued in various forms from the Andover Massachusetts school. We are patrons of all the works issued from that school, which we esteem the most learned, and of course the most candid and independent in America.

As it will be impossible for us, in any reasonable time, to send single copies to those who may wish for them, we shall solicit all our agents and patrons to order as many copies as they think they can dispose of; and on receiving the order accompanied with the price of copies ordered, leaving it to us to discount in proportion to the number, we risking the safe transportation of them and the price by mail, (*unless by special agreement other arrangements be made;*) we will, as soon as we get the works bound, proceed to forward them in the order in which we receive said orders. The first orders will be first filled. Those who order a box, will recollect that we must have proper directions as to the mercantile and commission houses to which they are to be addressed; and this ought to be in places the most contiguous to them.

As we have, with much personal labor and at great expense, finished this work, we earnestly request our patrons and friends to be as prompt as possible in forwarding their orders. The work we hope to be able to begin to distribute in March next.

EDITOR.

Biblical Criticism---No. 1.

THE MIND OF THE SPIRIT.

ΦΡΩΝΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ, (*phronema tou pneumatos.*) This phrase occurs but twice in the New Testament. It is in Romans viii. 6. in the King's version, rendered "*spiritually minded;*" by Macknight, "*minding the spirit;*" and in verse 27 of the same chapter it is rendered "*the mind of the spirit.*" We prefer the latter—and as the phrase *phronema tou sarkos* also occurs but twice, and in the same chapter, once translated "*to be carnally minded,*" and once "*the carnal mind,*" by the King's translators; and by Macknight and others, "*the minding of the flesh*"—we also prefer the same version of both phrases, and render the passage thus: *The mind of the flesh is death, and the mind of the Spirit is life and peace.* "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God"—and he that searches the hearts knows *the mind of the spirit.* Rom. viii. 27. Thus we have all the places in the book where these two phrases occur; and as the King's translators, Macknight, and many others, have, in the 27th verse, translated it "*the mind of the Spirit,*" we have their authority and that of Professor Stuart, for so rendering it in the new version. We are uniform, and so is Professor Stuart, and not any of the others. So much for authority.

But now for the meaning of this *mind.* It is admitted on all hands that this is not the word which is usually employed, or, perhaps, at all employed, to represent the simple understanding or mind of man. It is not νους, nor πνευμα; but φρονημα. It is an artificial or created mind—as is the mind of the merchant, mechanic, statesman, poet, &c.—a mind formed, or a taste or disposition acquired. Such is the usage of the word *phronema.* *Phroneo,* from which it is derived, signifies to *savor, taste,* or *relish.* "Peter, thou *savorest* not the

things that are of God, but the things of men"—You have a taste, relish, or savor for the one, and not the other. So the word is translated by the King's translators.

Now from this data, what does Paul mean by *the mind of the flesh* and *the mind of the Spirit*, Rom. viii. 6. vii. 27.? A savor, taste, or relish for the flesh, and a savor, taste, or relish for the things of the Spirit; or the disposition, desires, and longings produced by the flesh, and those produced by the Spirit. So must we understand the phrase if we attend to the original acceptations of the words and the canons of criticism. He that searches the hearts knows what is the desire of the Spirit—"*the bent of the Spirit*," says Thomson. Professor Stuart also remarks on this passage, "It is not *the mind of the Spirit of God*, in itself considered, and as belonging to the godhead, that the Searcher of Hearts is here represented as knowing. It is *the mind or desire of the Spirit* as disclosed in these inarticulate sighs or groans that the writer means to designate. In this way there is no difficulty in applying *pneuma* to the Spirit of God." Thus far the learned Professor; and with him we agree.

The *mind of the flesh* is, then, those desires after the flesh which the things of the flesh produce; and *the mind of the Spirit* is those tastes, relishes, desires, longings, which the Spirit of God works in the human soul; and, therefore, the longings, sighs, and groans of this Spirit are most intelligible to him whose offspring they are. The Spirit of God produces a mind like itself, and so do the things of the flesh. The former has for its fruit, life and peace—the latter ends in death. As St. Augustine does say we may say, on the "*cannot*" of Paul, Rom. viii. 7. "The mind of the flesh cannot be subject to the law of God. How can snow be warmed? for when it is melted and becomes warm, it is no longer snow." They that are led by the Spirit have the mind of the Spirit, and they only can enjoy life and peace.

EDITOR.

Biblical Criticism---No. 2.

THE FOUNDATION OF GOD.

"THE foundation of God stands sure, having this inscription, The Lord has made known them that are his; and let every one who names the name of the Lord depart from iniquity." 2 Tim. ii. 19. What is *the foundation of God*? How does it stand firm? and how does the saying, "The Lord will make known (or has made known) them that are his," prove it? These are three questions that must be intelligibly answered before the passage is understood. The common version is much more difficult: "Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his." From an attentive investigation of the context and the allusions in this passage, we are authorized thus to interpret it:—The foundation which God has laid for our faith is the Twelve Apostles; and this foundation stands firm because God has sealed their mission by his Holy Spirit, and has by these attestations made known them that are his. Let those who acknowledge Jesus as the Christ depart from these iniquitous men, (or the iniquity of Hymeneus and Philetus,) who, while they do *overthrow* the faith of some, by affirming, contrary to the Apostles, that the resurrection is past, cannot shake the foundation of faith which God has established.

The θεμελιον, or foundation here spoken of, Heb. vi. 1. denotes the principles of the Christian doctrine, the *foundation* of reformation; and in Rev. xxi. 14. denotes the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem, which are said to be the Twelve Apostles; and the church is built upon the *foundation* of the Apostles and Prophets, &c. Eph. ii. 20.

Paul seems to allude to the conspiracy of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in this passage; for he quotes the words of Moses on that occasion, as they stand in

the Septuagint, Num. xvi. 5. The Lord will show who are his. Com. Ver. Septuagint, γνω κυριος, The Lord will make known; for so the idiomatic import of *know* is in the *hiphil* form. In the phrase, "Depart from iniquity," he seems to allude to Moses, who said, (Num. xvi. 26.) "Depart from the tents of these wicked men." So Paul—Depart from the iniquity of such spirits as Hymeneus and Philetus.

"*Having this seal.*" A seal with an inscription upon it, was, in ancient times, fixed upon the foundation of edifices. Zechariah iii. 9. alludes to this custom in the rebuilding of the Temple. Jesus is said to be *sealed;* and the Christians, Jews, and Gentiles were *sealed* by the Holy Spirit; i. e. the attestations given by the Spirit to Jesus and the Apostles, were the *seal* of their divine mission. Thus the passage becomes plain and intelligible, and beautifully pertinent to Paul's purpose, when all the allusions and references are understood.

The word γνω, being 3d sing. 2d aor. is certainly most naturally rendered in the past time, though from some license, it has been rendered in the future. Paul certainly had good reason to say, that the Lord had already made known who were his Apostles and worthy to be believed. It could not be that he would have Timothy or any other person to wait for future developments whether the Apostles or Hymeneus and Philetus were most worthy of belief. I am thus particular in explaining this matter, because no translator or interpreter which I have consulted has rendered *egno* in the past indefinite, which it most obviously is. Some, indeed, give it the present, and some the future; but none the past time. This can only be accounted for on the supposition that they did not fully comprehend the meaning of the Apostle.

EDITOR.

Mr. Broaddus.

OUR worthy friend *Broaddus*, has had published in the *Richmond Herald* of the 14th ult. some remarks on our notice of the Dover Decree, which he is pleased to set forth under the heading of "*Unfair Representation Exposed;*" yet he arraigns not one item in said notice as untrue. He admits all the facts; and, indeed, censures "the acrimony" of the resolution which cut off the brethren before mentioned. But he does not like our comment on their conduct.

In his attempt to justify the excision of the churches from the Association he argues not from any fact, but from a slander which I am sorry to say he publishes in Virginia, though perhaps he is not the original author of it. But "he that takes up an evil report against his brother," differs only in degree from him who invents it. His words are—"Through the people called Reformers we found ourselves virtually connected with the Unitarians and Arians of the West, who deny the divinity of our Redeemer: for have they not there agreed to become one people?" What the above question means we are left to conjecture. Was he afraid to affirm the fact? or did he first condemn, and then ask for the proof? What an *inuendo!* "Are they not one people?" This is the gentleman who censures our statement under the title of "UNFAIR *Representation.*" Yes, indeed! "Have they not agreed to become one people!"

Now, if a few Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Universalists should be immersed, and the Dover Association should receive them into communion, and become *one people* with them, would not

Mr. Broaddus represent himself and his brethren as grievously slandered and reproached, if any one should publish that he, his brethren, and the Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Universalists have become one people? He would say, What an *unfair* representation! nay, what a slander upon such decent people! It is, then, wholly a slander to publish to the world as a fact, that the Reformers have become one people with the Arians and Unitarians of the West.

For my part, I regard no man as a believer in Jesus as the Messiah, who denies that he is a divine person, the only begotten of God; or who refuses to worship and adore him with all his heart, soul, mind, and strength. I fellowship no man nor people under the heavens, and I am sure none in the heavens, who are unwilling to admit that our Redeemer is Emanuel, God with us—God manifest in the flesh. [See an essay in the *Christian Baptist*, vol. 4, p. 230, on THE WORD that was in the beginning with God, and that was God.] As far as my acquaintance with all the brethren extends, North, South, East, or West, (whatever may have been their former opinions I know not,) they all accord in rendering the same honor in thought, word, and deed to the Son, as they do to the Father who sent him. They are opposed, indeed, to both Trinitarian, Arian, and Unitarian speculations on the *divine essence;* but all harmonize in regarding Jesus in all the high character which Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles give him in the full import and meaning of their words.

To prejudice his brethren in favor of the Decree, as well as against the excluded, with the same political dexterity, he would have them think that we regard them as only wanting the power to imprison, banish, or burn those who will not worship the idols which they have set up. We have, indeed, asked what they can do more under our laws; and Mr. Broaddus admits they have done all in their power, and justifies them for having done it on the aforesaid *allegata.*

But how does he justify his course? By an *argumentum ad hominem.* If he is erroneous, so are we; for, in his logic, not receiving an unbaptized person into the kingdom is just as criminal as excluding a citizen from it for a difference of opinion. Because we do not do what we were never asked to do—that is, to receive certain dead men, whom he supposes are now in heaven, or certain living men of the same stamp, we are as deep in the mire as himself, and brethren in excluding many living Christians from the kingdom, for no moral impropriety whatever; nay, whose moral and religious character, Mr. Broaddus himself being judge, is far superior to many of those whom he fellowships as worthy disciples.

Before I would do what Mr. Broaddus has done—vote, as unworthy of Christian fellowship, such citizens of Christ's kingdom as those whom he has judged unworthy of a place at *his* Lord's table—I would suffer myself to be excluded from all civilized and Christian society. But Mr. Broaddus can accomplish this with all good conscience: first call them Arians, or one with Arians and all that class of errorists, and then treat them as such.

In one word, I do not say nor think that any of the Virginia Baptists would burn myself or brethren; but unless they would burn, or banish, or otherwise inflict civil penalties upon us, what more can they do than what they have done? According to the laws of our government they can do no more, if they were so disposed, than call us by some odious name, and then treat us as guilty, without even the forms of trial.

But Mr. Broaddus is determined not to defend the ground he has taken; and exhorts his brethren to avoid the controversy. Good, and seasonable, and *politic* advice! This is what the Catholic priesthood have ten thousand times commanded their laity in Protestant countries—for the best reason in the world:—they know that they must always be foiled if they would dare to justify their faith or practice by scriptural argument. Mr. Broaddus tells them in the close that he would have his brethren to be reformers without the name; and that he is "aiming to steer a middle course—between Calvinism on the one hand, and Campbellism on the other." "That is high-toned, strait-laced, and systematic Calvinism and Campbellbellism!"* Well, a pleasant voyage, and a safe mooring to our friend Andrew Broaddus! EDITOR.

Dover Ordinance.

THE Ordinance or Decree of last October, nullifying the Constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the personal rights of Christians, it is said was passed without debate, and without much opposition. I wondered how this could be; but my surprise was greatly diminished on learning from an authentic source, from a member of the committee raised by said Association, whose moral and religious character no man can impeach, that the members of said Association friendly to reform, thought it most prudent to avoid every occasion of being chargeable with the common reproach of making divisions, and therefore permitted the opponents of reform to take their own course. The Decree was, indeed, drafted in Richmond, and all the arrangements were made for carrying it into effect, before the Association met. When before the committee, one brother, however, had the courage, though not seconded by another, to oppose to its passage the six following arguments:—

1. The Report represented the churches as in most distracted and disastrous circumstances; whereas the letters from the churches to the Association represented them as in peace and general harmony.

*I have the pleasure to learn that Mr. Broaddus often proclaims the necessity of reformation among the Baptists, and that many of his discourses would pass for good reforming sermons; and that the only thing which saves him from the *obloquy of a reformer*, is a vote or an essay in favor of orthodoxy! There are more than Andrew Broaddus who thus husband their orthodoxy while they accord with us in most matters: I say, *most matters;* for the points of difference are units or fractions, and the points of coincidence are tens and hundreds.

2. But if the letters give a false representation, and they were actually as represented in the Report, then the churches themselves, and not the Association, could take the proper steps to obtain peace.

3. That it was expressly contrary to the constitution of the Association to interfere with the internal affairs of the churches.

4. That the member who addressed the committee, though generally acquainted throughout the Association, knew of no person who maintained the things set forth in the Report.

5. That until the churches were consulted to know what was their wish in the case, it was premature to take any steps upon the request of *five* churches who alone wished the Association to take up the subject.

6. That it was unjust to take any final step at the present meeting, because many churches were not represented in it.

During the course of conversation in the committee, without any formal speech on the subject, these six arguments were urged to dissuade the authors of the Report from assuming such a high responsibility. And may not the appeal be made to the good sense of every unprejudiced man, whether there were not moral authority and rational gravity in any one of these six arguments, to deter any grave, considerate, honorable, and righteous committee from a measure so solemn, and so responsible to heaven and earth. But we never knew any ecclesiastical committee, determined on proscription, that was more influenced by reason or argument, than that committee which reported (with their fingers in their ears) in favor of the stoning of Stephen. We thought it good, for future reference, to record the leading arguments of a member of said committee, which must, we think, be regarded as a dignified and argumentative protest against the report. I may add, that in said committee, this brother was treated rather as a heretic before inquisitors, than as a citizen of Christ's kingdom, though admitted by all to be free from any specified error or immorality, and to be very useful among the churches.

EDITOR.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Mr. Editor,

OUR friend *Philalethes* contends for the Scriptures, the whole Scriptures, and nothing but the Scriptures; and then talks of "Adam" being made in the image of God, and of "man's immortality." I wish he would just point us to the place where such facts are recorded. The Apostle declares, "God only hath *immortality*." Christ was immortal after the resurrection—"he dieth no more;" but Adam and all his children are mortal and always were so according to the Scriptures. Christ was the image of God, the likeness of God, and he only. We infer from the first part of Genesis, that Adam was made *after* that likeness and image; that is, his body was made in shape like Christ's. Nothing more can I learn from the Scripture. Some more remarks on Philalethes' communication I intend to forward soon; also, on Mr. Milton's. Meanwhile I remain your friend,

A. B. G.

The Prophecies.

"THE LORD WILL REBUKE MANY PEOPLE."

THE Prophecies, in no period of the church's history, were so much studied as at the present day. Societies are forming in Britain for the especial purpose of getting at a systematic way of studying the all-engrossing future. Knowledge will increase and is increasing on this most interesting part of God's communications to man. Sixty volumes are already in the hands of one society, from sixty authors, advocating substantially the same views exhibited in the essays of Daniel, vol. 1. Be they right or wrong, one thing is becoming most evident to all the students of God's government over men, that the time is at hand when *the Lord will rebuke many people*, and destroy the policies which are now destroying the earth. We begin to doubt the permanency of our own political institutions; and men are now proving that no parchments, constitutions, or forms of government can throw efficient barriers in the way of the cupidity, ambition, and pride of man. These are more puissant agents than all the constitutions and laws of our confederated states. Politicians stand aghast; but the students of the Bible know that the atheism, infidelity, and mammonism, which inwardly work in all the governments of the Old World and the New, must consign them all to perdition.

The hierarchies of state and church are equally obnoxious to the curse, because equally hostile to the supremacy of the Lord Jesus, and equally opposed to the true interests and dignity of man. Not, indeed, that there are no governments, ecclesiastical and political, which guaranty certain rights, and extend to man safety and protection in some matters, and to a certain extent; but not a government on earth that gives that honor to man which belongs to him as man; and none that places *character* above *circumstances*, which is just the reverse of every principle avowed and inculcated by the present Governor of the Universe while he made his abode in this unfriendly world.

He will, therefore, overturn all the kingdoms of this world—all authorities and powers on earth, called by whatever name, which in anywise contravene the justice, peace, and good will among men which he always inculcated, and which he has made the paramount law in the constitution of human society.

So long as the sword is made the arbiter of righteousness, and ultimate appeal in national controversies, it is a clear proof that the nations are not rebuked—that they have not learned the principles of government which Heaven will patronize: for when the Lord shall have rebuked the nations, "they will beat their swords into pruning hooks, and learn war no more."

EDITOR.

Query.—IF to be born of water signifies to proceed and come forth from water, and the same expression is used relative to the Spirit, how are we to understand being born of the Spirit?

Answer.—We are not born twice into any kingdom, whether of nature, grace, or glory. The similitude used by our Lord is a beautiful one. There is one birth into the natural world, of which father and mother is the cause and the means. There is one birth into the kingdom of God in its present state, of which the Spirit and the water are the cause and the means. There will be one birth into the everlasting kingdom, of which the Lord and the grave will be the cause and the means. Nor is the last birth less analogous to the first, than is the second; for they that are in the grave shall hear his voice and come forth. His power places them in the grave, and his power will bring them forth.

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Essex, Va. October 31, 1832.

Brother Campbell,

Dear Sir,

THE long agony is over. The Dover Association has assumed the awful responsibility of producing a faction; consequently, a sect. We feel much relieved as respects ourselves. Only three or four of the reformers attended the Association, as we had no objection to being a separate people, if the Baptists were resolved on taking to themselves this act of rebellion against Jesus Christ our Lord. I venture to say, no intelligent friend of reform is displeased with it. For myself, I feel highly honored in being made the first martyr in Old Virginia in the present reformation. My christian character has been gibbeted (though I yet live) for adhering to the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. *Philip Montague* has unintentionally conferred this honor on me. It is the highest I ever expect to enjoy in time—worth all the D. D's that ever were issued from all the seminaries in our land. Had there been no charges made against us, the foregoing would be all I would say on this occasion. But I wish to speak to my brethren in order to stir them up to double diligence. T. M. H.

—

T. M. Henley's Address.

Brethren,

We are accused of being "*an antisectarian dogmatical sect.*" We know this charge is not true; and the writer knows it too, as well as a majority of those men concerned in bringing the case before the Association. In proof of this assertion, we refer to all our writings; but more especially to the declaration of Christian rights, facts, and documents, published in the city of Richmond last winter, by brother *Thomas Campbell*, for the express purpose of removing those unfounded imputations brought against us. Has any man living attempted to refute one fact or proposition therein? If so, we have never seen it. How men could, after much "*prayerful deliberation*," solemnly publish to the world such a libel, I cannot see. With these documents, which have been put into their hands, or forwarded to them by mail, how could they say that we held doctrines not according to godliness, but subversive of the true spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ, disorganizing and demoralizing in their tendency? This is an awful warning to us of the baneful influence of a sectarian spirit. How we can be said to be dogmatical, or a sect, when we leave every person, who has constitutionally entered the kingdom of Messiah, in the full enjoyment of his religious opinions, so long as he does not impose them upon us as terms of fellowship, and while he maintains the character of a disciple, as drawn by the pen of inspiration, and the examples of primitive christianity—surpasses my comprehension.

Nor could we be called a sect until they made us one. Now, as we were willing to have remained among them, and to be long suffering, forbearing, forgiving, even as God for Christ's sake had forgiven us, and to extend to them the hand of charity, notwithstanding we were persuaded they were laboring under serious errors; we did not feel authorised, for a difference of opinion, *to inflict any privation or punishment upon them*, or any other men. We were willing to follow the instruction of the Holy Spirit—"*Judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness*, and will make known the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God." They are, to demonstration, the factionists. He that makes a division, is, according to all our conceptions, the factionist. But these sheep, what have they done? The large majority of the Baptist people we consider not culpable for these high-handed measures of a few of their leaders. They are within the kingdom of Messiah; that is, all who have believed with their whole heart in Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God, and reformed their lives. This was our reason for wishing to continue with you, brethren; and for this reason we can still extend the hand of fellowship to all of you who maintain the character of disciples. Yes, brethren, we can take the New Testament in our hands, and meet every sinner under heaven, that believes it with his whole heart, and obeys it in the actions of his life and in the language of his lips. If this is dogmatism or sectarianism, so let it be. If this is of a disorganizing and demoralizing tendency, so let it be. We know that truth is great and mighty above all things, and will prevail; and this, I am persuaded, will be the only legitimate principle upon which the millennial day will be ushered in—if by moral means, and not by the terrific judgments of God, that glorious day is to dawn upon the world. The world can do no better than it has done on these sectarian establishments. If on the apostolic ground we cannot build, we cannot build on the sand of human opinions. Thus, brethren, we stand upon immutable ground, and before our superstructure can be razed, our foundation must be destroyed. We regard not the tongue of reproach or slander; none of these things move us. Let us, like the bee, draw honey from the bitterest herb. Let us live down the tongue of slander. Heretofore we have been oppressed, persecuted, and cast down. These things have too often embittered our spirits; but we have escaped with our lives in our hands; while thousands, *from the same cause*, have been sacrificed like the beast of the field. Let us be thankful to our heavenly Father, and take courage to press on toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. We have nothing to fear from such men, but that factious spirit which has always destroyed the disciples that obeyed God rather than man. *If that get among us, alas for us!* for it has been a hindrance to the salvation of the world. [See Rev. xii. 10.]

I can inform you, that the proceedings of the Association will produce one of two things—the downfall of the Baptists, or *the vassalage*

of every member that joins them. This thing is of the Lord, and we ought to rejoice in all his works, though they are like the devouring fire. Every unprejudiced intelligent man and woman will refuse to submit to such a dictation. They will not, in this day of gospel light and liberty, make an association of intolerant clergymen, "whose craft is in danger," *their Saviour.* I have heard of friends coming forward to aid us in erecting houses of worship in several neighborhoods. Liberty is too sweet to be sacrificed to a few ambitious men, whose love of power and the fleece is greater than that of the flock. How such men as *Andrew Broaddus, Richard Claybrook,* and *John Goodall,* who knew better, could have *descended* to such unchristian conduct, is astonishing to every intelligent man that has spoken of these proceedings to me.* It is well known that *the author of the preamble and resolution* has lost his standing with the intelligent and unprejudiced part of society in the city of Richmond. His oppressing, or rather impressing an intelligent pious *female,* contrary to her wish, into his service, drew forth from Mr. Broaddus a card which was published in the Herald in 1828. This "meek, pure, peaceable man, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality. and without hypocrisy;" all at once ushered forth an angry reply, charging Mr. Broaddus with *falsehood,* and with being made a *monkey's paw.* Mr. Keeling stept forth and sustained Mr. Broaddus by documents taken from the proceedings of Kerr's church against this body. Broaddus then demanded an explanation, or reference to his brethren of this conduct of Kerr's; which was not granted as I have heard of: consequently, Keeling being under his government, was charged with the basest conduct, and every effort was used to sink his reputation, which this "oppresser of the brethren" so much delights in. Keeling came out of this furnace without even the smell of fire on his garment, tenfold more valuable than his accusers.† This restless and ambitious man, *whose love of power and the fleece* has kept his church more or less in the fire of contention ever since, yet talks about others disturbing the peace and harmony of the churches. Many of you may remember what a state of things he produced in the city of Richmond, by collecting, by previous appointment, *in the night, the colored people,* in order to make a collection of money *from these poor creatures for his support.* You must have seen in the Herald of October 7th, 1831, the evidence of this man's "divine love," "the spirit and manner of his writings," how "remarkably he was filled with the mind of Christ;" "his suffering long; his kindness; not vaunting himself; not behaving himself unseemly; not puffed up; seeking not his own; not easily provoked; thinking no evil; full of charity to all men." Hear him in the fol-

**We did not expect better things of John Kerr, Eli Ball, J. B. Jeter, Philip Montague, and John Mason.*

†Mr. Kerr's having gone back seven years, has led me to go back four. I might have reminded him of the distress created nearly 30 years ago, which caused a query to be sent to an Association. See Semple's History of the Baptists, page 241. He is the same man now.

lowing words:—"Surely it requires a being whose heart is as foul as a nest of unclean birds, as poisonous as a den of hissing adders, to originate or to believe such reports. Hence I have considered the reports themselves, their malign propagators, and all those who for a moment affected to believe or countenance them, not only beneath my notice; but, if possible, beneath my contempt;" "Practical Atheists, aided by *a host of sectarian bigots;* nefarious hypocrites, *professing to be Christians, while they are wolves in sheep's clothing:*" "black mendacity;" "Satan's wooden nutmeg pedlars."

I have thus given you a fair sample of this man's pious spirit when he is opposed or misrepresented. Now that he is guilty of *the very same conduct that his accusers were,* all is right. I have not mentioned these things to rail upon him—far from it; but it proves to the world the absolute necessity of a radical reformation, which he forbids us to go on with at the pains and penalties of his fellowship, and of such like kindred spirits. What a bugbear is this! This "opposer of the brethren" would make us believe he would lay down his life for the church of Jesus Christ, and yet seeks to destroy its peace, purity, and unity; nay, I am informed he said, when he produced the *faction* in his church, he "was willing to lay down his life for that church;" at the same time had a note in his pocket, written by himself, which was read to the church afterwards, saying, in substance—Unless that church would that night (I think it was) guaranty to him his salary of 1200 or 1000 dollars, he should no longer consider himself their Pastor; which was done by four of the opposers of reformation. Thus you have the evidence before you of the absolute necessity of a radical reformation, in order to our freedom from the kingdom of the clergy, whose love of power and the fleece never will be surrendered without it. This is the reason of the turmoil, factions, and divisions. *Hence the invitation to the churches to produce a faction, and then blame us for it.*

This Association admits they hold doctrines dear to their heart, distinct from the writings of the Apostles as they stand on the sacred pages. If they do not, they have wilfully injured us; for they all know we are opposing the inferences, reasonings, opinions, or deductions of any man or set of men, *as articles of faith, or terms of union, and communion among the disciples of Jesus Christ; and in contending earnestly for the all-sufficiency and the alone sufficiency of the gospel of Jesus Christ for our salvation, as handed down to us in the sacred volume,* without attaching any human opinion or scheme of men. Seeing this is the case, our opposers may take hold of either horn of the dilemma, and they are transgressors against the Lord Jesus Christ; and, without reformation, stand condemned at his bar with his laws in their hands. An awful condition, indeed!

I will give you a fair specimen of the manner in which they teach the people. In the Religious Herald of the 21st September, 1832, *under the editorial head,* you will find a labored effort to produce a *faction in the churches.* The only mutilated Scripture, quoted for this purpose, was intended to prove that a *difference in opinion or doctrine*

was destructive of Christian fellowship. "Except two be agreed, how can they walk together? *is the language of an inspired Apostle.*" No Apostle has ever used any such language; for it would destroy their own doctrine. Difference of opinion must, in the nature of things, be granted, or we cannot be accountable beings to God. The only Scripture that has any likeness to the one made and put into the mouth of an Apostle, you will find chap. iii. 3. of Amos: "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Please read the 1st, 2d, to the 3d verse of the 3d chapter of the book of Amos, and you will find this Scripture was attempted to be quoted to justify their transgression against the government of our Saviour, which was used by the Prophet *to show the justness of God in punishing the Israelites for that very thing*—their wickedness; not that their opinions or doctrines were worse than those of Damascus, Gaza, Tyrus, Edom, Ammon, Moab, and Judah. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you" [for a difference of opinion? No.] *for all your iniquities.* Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Thus you see it was the *conduct*, and not the *opinions* or *doctrines* of the Israelites, God struck at. This is as correct an example of the teaching and preaching of our opponents, quoted above, as I am able to give of "*their doctrines* so dear to their hearts."

Brethren. I would here remind you, that there is "a show of wisdom in will worship, in humility, and neglecting of the body, not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh." This the Holy Spirit admits. Hence if we teach any thing not revealed in the New Testament, or enjoin any thing on the disciples as an article of faith, or term of union and communion, for which there is not an express precept or precedent; this, to all intents and purposes, would be teaching the *doctrines and commandments of men.* And let all remember that such institutions, originating from the will of man, are opposed to the authority of Jesus, and to submit to them is will-worship. However wise, humble, and self-denying it may appear, it is WILL WORSHIP, not the worship of God. All commandments and doctrines of men are another gospel, different from that taught by the Holy Spirit. If those men could prove they were specially called and sent, or they were angels, yet they would be under the curse of God. See Gal. i. 8, 9. All additions, or traditions, bring their authors into condemnation; as much so, as if they had never believed the gospel. The closing address of Jesus to a dying world, stands as a lesson to us. "I, JESUS, have sent my angel to *testify* unto you *these things in the churches.* I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star. And the Spirit and Bride say, Come; let him that heareth say, Come," &c. These men say, "You shall not say, Come." What follows? "For I testify unto *every man* that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if *any man* shall add thereto, these things," [what things? Surely the things spoken of in the foregoing verse were included,] "*God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book.* And if *any man* shall take away from the words of the

book of this prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." See Rev. xxii. 16—19. Who are they that can say with Paul, "Let God be true, though it prove every man a liar." Such, and such only, are *the willing worshippers of God.* No man that makes his opinions of truth terms of union and communion, can be a willing worshipper of God. A will-worshipper he may be, the Holy Spirit admits. Brethren, our serving God as Paul did before his conversion, "from his forefathers, with *pure conscience;*" our zeal for the traditions of men, *compassing sea and land;* our eloquence, like an Appollos; our self-denying conduct, like the hermit; our voluntary humility, like the sisters of charity; or our show of wisdom, or mortification of the flesh—all, all will not do, if we knowingly *add to, or take from, the written word of God.* Gone, forever gone, damned, forever damned must we be. Seeing these things will be so, let us keep a watchful eye over ourselves, lest we should follow the opinions and doctrines of uninspired men. "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the *yoke of bondage.*

Yours in the blessed hope of a glorious immortality,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

Being requested by our correspondent, and by other brethren in Virginia, to give a place to the preceding address, under the assurance that the crisis in Virginia required it, we comply with their wishes, and reserve the second part of our address to the Virginia Baptists till next month. The allusions and direct references to one or two individuals in the preceding document, is, perhaps, necessary to the object of the writer, to enforce the necessity of reformation; but the propriety of such illustrations may be questionable, as it gives a conspicuity to certain individuals, which, while it may be gratifying to them, affords them an opportunity to ring the changes on the eight notes of persecution. Though no man, with but one eye, and that of imperfect organization, can think that either the honor, reproach, or persecution of such men is "*for righteousness sake.*" For our part, we sympathize even with Mr. Kerr and his associates in this crisis. They are alarmed for "*the double honor*" which they have so long enjoyed; and as the moment of fear, or anger, or strong passion, is not the time of reason nor reflection, they are precipitated to acts and deeds, of which, at another time, and in other circumstances, they would have considered themselves wholly incapable. And no doubt the time may come, when reason resumes her throne, that they will mourn over the rash measures and ill-advised councils which must ultimate in their own prostration and disgrace. "He that exalts himself shall be humbled, and he that humbles himself shall be exalted." As the intelligence of the community rises, such men and measures must, in the same ratio, fall in public esteem. And he who would keep pace with the growing intelligence of the community at this

day, must double his diligence, or he will be found far in the rear of his contemporaries—in company with men of other times, who could not spell the words which our children now pronounce with the utmos ease. EDITOR.

A Voice from Jerusalem.

THE following heart-touching appeal from the sons of Israel, deserves the most sympathizing attention from all among the Gentiles, who are the children of Abraham by promise. Will not the Gentile, who is grafted into the good olive tree, when he reads the following letter from the remnant of Jacob according to the flesh, remember this oracle of Moses. It was written 3330 years ago:—

"The land of your enemies shall eat you up. And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in their enemy's lands; and also in the iniquity of their fathers shall they pine away with them. If they shall confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespasses which they trespassed against me, and also that they have walked contrary to me, and that I also have walked contrary to them, and brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land. I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen: for I am the Lord their God." EDITOR M. H.

From the New York Courier & Inquirer.

WE beg leave to invite the attention of the benevolent to the following statement of the distressed situation of the Jews in Jerusalem, and to their appeal for aid. We indulge a hope that the aid they seek will not be withheld; and as the society established in this country for the conversion of the Jews, have a large fund, without any ostensible mode of appropriating it to a good purpose, it is presumed that they will transmit it to Jerusalem with as little delay as possible.

From the Christian Intelligencer.

THE RABBI FROM THE HOLY CITY.

DR. WESTBROOK—The following is a literal version of the letter which the *Rabbi Enoch Zindal*, now in our city, brought from the Jews of Jerusalem. On Monday evening last this learned Jew met a party of our clergymen, and other friends, in Dr. Brownlee's study. Mr. Roy, an emine Hebrew scholar, presented this version which he made, together with the original document, written in beautiful Hebrew letter, without points. It was examined by the learned gentlemen present. The evening was spent in hearing the Rabbi, who is

a truly polite and accomplished man, detail many interesting things relative to Jerusalem, the holy city, and the condition of the Jews there.

He spoke of the famous Mosque, which stands on the site of Solomon's Temple; and stated that it was the custom of his afflicted and bowed down people, especially the Priests, to go to the *west wall* of the Mosque, where once stood the *west wall* of the Temple, and, kneeling down, to offer up prayers to Jehovah the Almighty God in behalf of their nation. This explains a singular expression in the beginning of the following letter.

He admitted the fact that his people had more than once attempted, in olden times, to rebuild the Temple; but that infallible proofs of God's displeasure had always prevented it. This tradition may refer to the attempts in the Emperor Julian's time.

He gave replies to many difficult questions proposed to him on various passages of the Hebrew Bible. His views of the *Nahash*, the *serpent* who tempted our first parent, exhibit fully as much originality as those of Dr. Adam Clark. The latter decides this shrewd being to have been the *ourang outang*. Our Rabbi makes it a singular kind of *beast*, having a kind of a soul; and appointed by God to be a waiter, a body attendant on our first parents. Into this creature the devil entered, and made him an instrument of the temptation. This, however, he gave out of the Cabbals and Targum.

He gave some original views on the *giants* of the days of Noah; showing them to be different (as in the Hebrew expression they are strikingly distinguished) from the Goliaths, and the Anakim. They were giants in wickedness, the wicked children of profligate great men, and nobles!

The Rabbi, who is a thorough-going Jew, felt some difficulty when requested to explain how the Jews are to determine the evidence of their *coming Messiah*, proceeding in lineal descent from the tribe of Judah, and house of David. For he admitted the lists of the genealogy had utterly perished. When requested by Dr. Knox to explain his views of Daniel's seventy weeks, the Rabbi shrugged up his shoulders, and declined the task. He is fully in the belief of the Jews being recalled to their own land; and, by the calculation he makes, this recall is at the very door. It is to commence in the year 1841—only nine years hence. He believes that the present movements of the victorious Egyptians are now working out their deliverance. The Jews consider the Mahometans as the head of their oppressors, and the Court of Constantinople as the head of the Mahometan power. That being laid low, (and he supposes by the Pacha of Egypt, who is the avowed friend of the Jews,) their deliverance will then be speedily hastened.

The Rabbi's people of Jerusalem had heard of the exceeding benevolence and charity of the Americans. These are his own words:—"You did much for the Greeks; and will you not admit, even as Christians, lovers of the Old Testament Patriarchs and Prophets, that you owe at least as much—nay, much more, *to us the Jews?*" "Yes,"

said a gentleman present, "we love your people for the love of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob." "Yes," said another, "we should love and aid them for the sake of Joseph and Mary!" "And above all," said a third, "for the Son of Mary: Our Redeemer, according to the flesh, was a Jew!"

And as this is the first appeal made to us as Christians, by the Jews, direct from Jerusalem, we should, by responding to the voice of suffering humanity, give them an evidence that we are, as *Christians*, their true and sincere friends.

The Rabbi begs leave to refer those who may feel disposed to aid the poor suffering Jews at Jerusalem, to the following gentlemen, who have kindly undertaken to receive any funds which benevolent Christians may condescend to give, viz.—The Rev. Mr. SCHROEDER; the Rev. JACOB BRODHEAD, D. D.; the Rev. W. W. PHILIPS, D. D.; the Rev. W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.

—

HEBREW LETTER.

Translated from the Hebrew by Mr. Roy, of New York.

From the City of the Great King: Peace and blessing to the great and good gentlemen who are disposed to be benevolent to all friends and foes.

Mordecai Noah, we have written to you from the Holy Land, and from the City of Jerusalem. We pray always by the west wall of the Temple, and by all the holy places, for all the nations of the earth who remember us in our low estate. The voice of Zion speaks weeping and lamenting for the wretched state of her children; for their faces are black with hunger. All the people of foreign nations here are very poor, and unable to give us relief. The learned men and Rabbis, widows and orphan children that were supported by Russia, Poland, and Germany, are cut off from their former supplies, and receive no compensation from those nations. We are so poor, and in such distress, that we cannot represent our situation in writing. We are hungry, thirsty, and naked. Our children ask bread, and we have none to give them. And, in addition to this, the Turks have laid us under a contribution of fifty thousand dollars, which, if not paid, will be the ruin of all the Jews here. Dear sir, we did not know how to help ourselves; and we heard of your great and benevolent feelings, and have sent on the Rabbi Enoch Zindal, of Jerusalem, son of the great Rabbi Hersh, one of the most learned men in the world. He will fully explain to you our afflictions. We, therefore, pray you to help him by any way and means in your power, by obtaining donations, and forming societies among all denominations. And we will pray for you in all the holy places, and from the sepulchres of the holy Prophets; and we hope with all the scattered tribes, and the Messiah at their head, to meet you soon in the Holy City, the desire of all nations.

(Signed) Rabbi TOBIAS SOLOMON,
The High Priest of Jerusalem, [and others.]

Dr. Beattie's Opinion of Dr. Campbell's Translation.

THE celebrated Dr. Beattie, of Aberdeen, well known in the republic of letters, in a volume of his epistles to his correspondents, expresses himself in the following style concerning the literary labors of the author of the version of the *Testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.* The learned reader needs not to be informed that Drs. Beattie and Campbell were Professors in the same University, and occupied a large space in the chronicles of Scotch literature in the close of the last century. The judgment of such a man as Dr. Beattie is of more moral weight than the decision of a generation of partizans fired by a misguided zeal, or shackled by the restraints of religious prejudice. The reader will perceive from these letters, what sort of spirit actuated this illustrious critic, who spent so many years in completing a version of about one-third of the apostolic writings.

EDITOR.

Dr. Beattie to Sir William Forbes.

"ABERDEEN, 25th October, 1782.

"ELPHINSTON'S '*Martial*' is just come to hand. It is truly a *unique*. The specimens formerly published did very well to laugh at; but a whole quarto of nonsense and gibberish is too much. It is strange that a man, not wholly illiterate, should have lived so long in England, without learning the language.

"I have lately been very much entertained and instructed with a work of a different nature, which will do honor to this country, and be a blessing to mankind—Dr. Campbell's Translation of the four Gospels, with explanatory and critical annotations. I have revised the first eighteen chapters of Matthew; and am really astonished at the learning and accuracy of the author. He had before given the world sufficient proofs of both; but this will be his greatest work. It will be accompanied with preliminary dissertations, for explaining what could not be conveniently illustrated in notes. I have read the titles of the Dissertations, and shall soon have them in my hands. The whole will make, as I guess, two quarto volumes. I have several times studied the gospels in the original; but had no idea, till now, that the common translation stood so much in need of a revisal."

Dr. Beattie to Sir William Forbes.

"ABERDEEN, 2d March, 1783.

"I HAVE been more idle, and more in company, this winter than I used to be; which the Doctor tells me is good for my health. But I

have not been quite idle. I have revised, with all the attention I am master of, Dr. Campbell's new translation of Matthew and Mark, with the notes upon it, and ten or twelve of his preliminary dissertations; and that this revisal has been the work of some time, you will readily believe, when I tell you, that I have written, of critical remarks, not less than seventy or eighty quarto pages. Many of these, indeed, I thought of little moment; but as lovers before marriage are advised to be as quick-sighted, and after marriage as blind as possible, to one another's faults; so I consider it my duty to be as captious as possible in the revisal of a friend's work before publication, and when it is published to be captious no longer. The Principal, however, is pleased to think more favorably than I do of my strictures, and tells me he has adopted nine-tenths of them. Of the translation of Luke and John, and the notes upon it, and of four or five more preliminary dissertations, he has the materials almost ready; but they are not yet put together. The whole will amount to two large quartos at least; and will, in my opinion, be one of the most important publications that has appeared in our time. It is really a treasure of theological learning, exact criticism, and sound divinity; and has given me more information, in regard to what may be called scriptural knowledge, than all the other books I have ever read. His translation conveys the meaning of the original very correctly, and, so far as I could observe, neither adds nor takes away a single idea; but I have told him, that I wish it had been more strictly literal, and more conformable to the Greek (or rather to the Hebrew) idiom, which is in many things congenial to the English. His love of conciseness makes him sometimes less simple, though perhaps not less expressive, than the original, and sometimes less harmonious than the common version. But I believe most of the passages of this sort, that I objected to, will be mended."

Dr. Beattie to Mrs. Montagu.

"ABERDEEN, 25th March, 1789.

"MY friend Dr. Campbell's great work (a new translation of the Gospels, with preliminary Dissertations, and Notes critical and explanatory, in two volumes 4to) is published at last. I carefully read the whole manuscript, and wrote many a sheet of remarks and criticisms upon it; and have no scruple to say, that it is one of the most important publications in theology, if not *the most important*, that has appeared in my time. It will give the public, at least the rational part of the public, a very high idea of the learning, acuteness, industry, candor, and piety of the author; who is my next neighbor, and with whom I have lived in the same society, upon the most intimate terms, for almost thirty years. It is about forty years since he engaged in this important work; and yet I am afraid he will not get so much by it as Mr. Sheridan did by the comedy of the *Duenna*."

Dr. Beattie to Sir William Forbes.

"ABERDEEN, 31st January, 1791.

"I HAVE too often sent you letters that must have given you pain: I am happy in having it in my power to send one that will give you pleasure. I beg you will let Mr. Baron Gordon and Mr. Arbuthnot know the contents of it.

"Our Principal Campbell's disorder has taken an unexpected and very favorable turn. I sat with him half an hour to-day, and found, to my inexpressible satisfaction, that his fever is gone; that he has little to complain of, and that he now begins to have hopes of recovery. I have seldom seen him more cheerful: and he would willingly have talked much more than I would allow him to do. Few things have ever happened to me in life that gave me more satisfaction than the prospect of his recovery. It is a blessing to the public, of inestimable benefit to Marishal College, and to me a very singular mercy. In consequence of it, I feel my heart more disengaged and light, than it has been these many months. May God confirm his recovery, and preserve him! The physicians both entertain sanguine hopes.

"You, my dear sir, and I, have seen several instances of the power of christianity in triumphing over death. I saw many instances of it on a late occasion, that nearly affected me. I must give you a little anecdote which Mrs. Campbell told me to-day:—At a time when Dr. Campbell seemed to be just expiring, and had told his wife and niece that it was so, a cordial happened unexpectedly to give him relief. As soon as he was able to speak, he said that he wondered to see their countenances so melancholy, and covered with tears, in the apprehension of his departure. At that instant, said he, I felt my mind in such a state, in the thoughts of my immediate dissolution, that I can express my feelings in no other way, than by saying, that I was *in a rapture.* The feelings of such a mind as Dr. Campbell's, in such an awful moment, when he certainly retained the full use of all his faculties, deserve to be attended to. When will an infidel die such a death!

"I have a thousand things to say; but after what I said last, every thing else is impertinent. Adieu. May God bless Lady Forbes and your family."

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Wind and Spirit---again.

The Spirit breathes where he pleases, and you hear the voice of him; but cannot tell whence it comes and whither it goes: so is every person who is born of the Spirit.——*John* iii. 8.

'TO err is human.' This the experience and observation of every man attest. But to confess our errors, *how hard!* How much more natural—howmuch more congenial to the mind of the flesh, to justify, excuse, or palliate them. And yet, To confess that we have erred,

when convinced of the fact, is only saying, that we are wiser to-day than we were yesterday.' And when the TRUTH requires it, alike do our duty and our happiness.

For several years past, the TRUTH with us has been the pearl of great price: in the pursuit of it, we have had occasion, on many points, to change our views—to yield up opinions; and some, from their supposed value, very dear to us. But this is the common experience of all, whose object is the same, and who take the same course of examining, thinking, and re-examining for themselves, to attain it. Three years ago, having added to our faith from testimony; and to our knowledge, from studying the Scriptures; we were constrained to give up a whole set of opinions, and with them (they having been principles of action) '*a living*,' that we might keep a good conscience, and the better follow and serve our Lord and Redeemer. But still we are '*human*.' Since our essay on "Wind and Spirit" of December last was published, we have discovered in it the following errors:—

1. "It," referring to the Holy Spirit, is several times used for *he*.

2. There being nothing in Greek expressed for the English nominative to "comes" and "goes"—as the pronoun may be either "it" or "he;" and may refer to *sound*, *report*, "voice," or "Spirit;" we would now, after the sentence, "As *you* know not whence the Spirit of God comes, and whither he goes," have supplied; *or the voice of him, or the report of his breathing*.

3. We said, "We have but one word," &c. "*Pneuma*."

We meant not by this, that *Pneuma* was the only word in the Greek language translated into English by *either* wind or spirit. We knew that *anemos*, in the Septuagint of the Old, and in the Greek of the New Testament, was also rendered *wind*. But we meant that *Pneuma* was the only representative of *both*. But, "but" in this sentence may be an error. *But*, again—(We now come to the CAPITAL *mistake*.) Knowing the Septuagint use of the word *Pneuma*, we supposed the New Testament use to be the same. This we have since found to be an error.

What now have we lost, and what gained by this discovery? As on the above supposition rested the corner stone of our edifice; what comes of the superstructure—of the new translation? Is it *wind—all* WIND? Nay, verily: but *spirit—all* SPIRIT! The *wind* is all blown away, and with it the *sand* of supposition. We know our translation to be based upon *rock*. It is *spirit* and not wind, *three hundred and thirty-nine* to *one!* John iii. 8. if it be an exception, is the only one in all the New Testament, in which the word *Pneuma* occurs *three hundred and thirty-nine times! Pneumata*, Heb. i. 7. translated in the common version *spirits*, being a quotation from the Old Testament, (Psalm civ. 4.) we do not regard as an exception; and would not, if in this place translated *winds*. "He makes winds his angels." But *anemos* is the New Testament word for *wind*. This occurs *twenty-nine times;* in all of which it is translated wind, and in none spirit. *Anemos* for wind, *twenty-nine* to *two*. John iii. 8. and Acts ii. are exceptions, or rather supplements, in the common version of *wind* being

made from other words. Putting both together, *three hundred and thirty-nine*, plus *thirty-one*, minus the exceptions, we have THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY to TWO!!

Now had *Pneuma* been used in the New Testament as in the Old, for both wind and spirit; having also this more definite word, *anemos*, for wind; we would here have offered two additional arguments for our translation on our first premises:—1st. From the Saviour's knowledge and previous use of *anemos;* and 2d. From the meaning of *thelei*, (*pleases*,) in construction with *Pneuma:* but now we need them not. It now appears, that we have two words in the Greek of the New Testament, viz. *pneuma* and *anemos*, for the two English words *spirit* and *wind;* and that they are never used in these writings interchangeably: therefore, if spirit in English means *spirit*, and not *wind;* and if wind in English means *wind*, and not *spirit;*—then must *Pneuma*, John iii. 8. be translated, as we have rendered it, *spirit* first and last.

A word or two farther now, on the *meaning* of this passage. In the beginning of Acts ii. we are informed, that 'when the day of Pentecost had fully arrived, the Apostles and their companions were all, with one accord, in one place; and, suddenly, there came from heaven, *echos*, a *sound*, as of a rushing, mighty *pnoes*, *breathing*, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.' The effect of this was, 'there appeared to them separated tongues, as of fire; and it rested upon each of them. And they were all filled *pneumatos agiou*, *with the Holy Spirit.*' How happily correspondent are our two exceptions! In the first (John iii. 8) we have *to Pneuma pnei*, *the Spirit breathes;* and in the second (Acts ii. 2.) *pnoes Pneumatos*, *the breathing of the Spirit*, shown. Now, for 'the *report* of it'—'the sound,' or 'rumor of the Spirit's breathing;'—or, as we have translated *ten phonen autou*, at the head of this article, *the voice of him.*'—"And they began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." The '*report of it*,' or '*the Spirit's voice*,' it hence appears, was then heard in the *Spirit's word.* But, as with Nicodemus a short time before, who heard it from the mouth of *him*, 'who spoke as man never spoke;' so now with the multitudes here assembled; 'they were all in amazement and perplexity, and said one to another, What does this mean? Others mocking, said, These men are filled with new wine.' They knew not whence the *voice* came, nor whither it went; nor whence nor whither the *Divine Agent*, who spoke to them. But what said Peter? "These men are not drunk, as you suppose; but this is that which was spoken of by the Prophet Joel: "And it shall come to pass, in the last days, says God, I will *pour out of my Spirit* upon all flesh."

PHILOLOGUS.

Sir Walter Scott.

SIR WALTER SCOTT, the star that beamed with such effulgence in the heavens of romance, has vanished from the gaze of mortals. The lovers of poetry and fiction are in deep mourning;

and all the votaries of *Waverly* are clothed in sadness. The fall of a monarch, from the giddy heights of his ambition; or the demise of some mighty chief, who guided the destinies of nations, could not call forth such a display of sorrow, as the exit of this most accomplished story-teller. The genius, the admirable genius of the author of fifty tales of fashion, dwells upon the tongues of all the young Misses and Masters, who riot upon the delicious products of imagination. The veteran maids and the ruthless odd fellows, who frequent enchanted fields and castles, exclaim, that the immortal author of a hundred romantic visions has "paid the debt of nature," and that mortal eyes shall never see his like again. The critics and reviewers, the poetasters and novelists, the romancers and fabulists, are in bitterness because their model is no more—because this liberal purveyor for their amusement has left the world of shadows, and has mingled with the nations of the dead in the world of realities.

The world often most admires that which has the least true merit. If some extraordinary genius, or some giant of prodigious stature, appear upon the stage, the pigmies are all amazed, and know not how to limit their admiration. But if real goodness, which is only another name for real greatness, happen to appear among us, only one in a thousand sees any thing divine in it. Yet even the giddy multitude, in some reflecting moment, is constrained to admit that no person is worthy of praise for his intellectual stature, more than for his animal dimensions: and that matters of choice, and not of contingence, are the proper subjects of praise or blame.

But no man is a scholar, a poet, or an author by the mere force of genius. Much labor, care, and toil are necessary to furnish the most splendid genius with the materials for future creations. Grant all this, and more: the miser too is laborious; so are all the votaries of pleasure. Neither talent nor toil, apart, or united, are worthy of admiration, unless consecrated to some high end, pregnant with real good to man.

To whom, then, let us ask, is the memory of *Sir Walter Scott* most dear? To those, doubtless, to whom the labors of his pen administered the most gratification. And who are they?——

We ask not whether he offered incense to the Whigs or Tories, or labored to prop the falling glories of the British Throne in his Life of Napoleon. We ask not, whether he sought to rivet again the chains of a heartless hierarchy upon the lacerated necks of an oppressed people. We do not inquire whether he labored to erase from the escutcheons of English Lords and Scottish Peers the stigmata of their ancestors, either in his poems or his novels; but we ask, To what taste, and to what fashion, and to what sort of minds did he devote the whole labors of his life?——The airy, frothy, and fantastic minds of those who live without an object, and die without a hope.

But "he wrote some sermons." So did the author of Tristram Shandy and the far-famed Swift. Yes, these versatile genii have ministered to the stage, the toilet, and the pulpit with equal impartiality and *eclat.* They have made the theatres resound with acclamations; and on Sundays, their *sermons,* well pronounced, have extorted from the

eyes of sinners, tears of the deepest contrition. Admirable men! No wonder the glare of their genius so dazzles the eyes of their admirers that they cannot see objects of real worth.

The world, however, knows how to appreciate them that appreciate it, and will be lavish of its praises upon them who minister to its taste. But it has no honors nor encomiums for them who honor God and their own race. The closest imitator of the great model of every perfection—the most devoted follower of the Saviour of the world, who spends his days and nights in acts of human kindness—who points the perishing sinner to the Lamb of God —who visits the abodes of affliction and distress—who wipes the tear of misery from the cheek of woe, and pours the wine and oil of Christian sympathy into the wounds and bruises of the unfortunate—gives up the ghost, and the world is silent! No panegyrist dilates upon his excellencies, or recounts his hundred acts of heaven-born charity, the least of which will shine with incomparably superior splendor in the true heaven of real glory, than ever shone this meteor in the ideal heavens of the idolators of fiction.

It is thus, however, the god of this world holds in homage to himself the sons of the flesh; and by such rewards he allures and binds to his interests the best talents, as well as the thoughtless crowds who feel not the majesty of Almighty Love, and brooke not submission to the Prince of Peace. Alas, for the times! Alas, for Christian nations! when the taste and fashion, which fill the higher circles and the lofty places in society, can bestow such unmeasured praises on the inventor of a thousand fables, because he has told them in a *graceful style;* and allow to die neglected and unnoticed the sons of God, the unassuming disciples of him who assiduously went about doing good.

But they are not of this world, and the world acknowledges them not. Yet there is a world where they will shine in brighter glories; where their virtues will be all appreciated: for there is one whose judgment of human worth, of true greatness, and true goodness, cannot be biassed by false appearances, and which infinitely preponderates over the reviews, and criticisms, and verdicts of the whole race of sycophants who judge after the flesh. He it is that can bestow an immortality of fame on earth, and an eternity of honor in the highest heavens. It was he who said, 'Wheresoever in all this world the gospel is preached, this token of love to my person, which this woman has bestowed, shall be told to her honor.'

Christians, let us aspire to the honor which comes from God, and let us devote our talents, whether few or many, to the honor of our Lord, and to the good of those he loves; and thus our names, though not enrolled amongst the mighty, and the noble, and the illustrious on earth, will be found engraven on the heart of him who wears the eternal crown of unfading glory in the Palace of the Universe.

"These characters will fair abide,
Our everlasting trust;
When gems, and monuments, and crowns
Are moulder'd down to dust."

EDITOR.

Inquirer's Explanations.

Dear Brother Campbell,

AN Editor, I apprehend, occupies, in some degree, the place of a Moderator or President of a deliberative body. It is his part to see that due decorum be observed on the part of correspondents, and also that they speak so as to conduce to the purposes of edification in reference to the subject in hand. Recognizing you fully in this capacity on the present occasion, I venture again (and intend to be brief) to address you; and, through you, Philalethes, on the subject of his late reply to me, leaving you vested with full discretion to exercise the call to order.

In the first place, I thank you for your kind effort to conciliate, and to show that there is no *real* difference between Philalethes and myself. This I was inclined to think, when first his criticism on "*matheteuo*" appeared. It seems to me, however, that the use of the epithets "real," "formal," "nominal," and "avowed," instead of doing good, do but "lead to bewilder." We see no such terms in the Scriptures—they take a straight forward course—we see no such distinctions as "real and avowed disciples." When they speak of disciples, they mean what they say exactly, and do not turn aside to obviate the quibbles which we poor erring mortals frequently find it necessary to anticipate. If any are disposed to quibble in reference to God's communications to us, they do it at their peril.

Philalethes says, "It is untrue, that however *real* a disciple or person may have been, he would not have been recognized by the Apostles as such, unless immersed." I assert, and he denies. I say an unimmersed person would not have been recognized as a disciple by the Apostles. Philalethes says he would. Now where is his proof? He does, indeed, seem to think he has proved it; for he says, "It is, *therefore*, untrue;" but where is his proof? Nothing but his own argument, not a scrap of Scripture, not an example from the *authoritative* book. Where is one called a disciple from the opening of Messiah's reign, who was not immersed? Sir, I conceive there was more in the critical remarks offered by yourself on this point some time ago, than has been generally conceded. My observation and reading have not been sufficiently extensive to authorize me fully to assume the position which you took with regard to the imperative mood and the active participle; but this much, I am very much inclined to think, that as a general position, the participle is a word of circumstance to the verb in connexion with which it is used—that it conveys the idea of either cause, manner, time, &c. I think Philalethes will allow that *immersing* is at least one of the circumstances or ad juncts attending the making of a disciple. But he talks a good deal about the "examination previous to immersion, to which the Apostles subjected all applicants for immersion in their day," and the subsequent practice "even in our day;" and offers this as "conclusive evidence" that persons were recognized as disciples before immer-

sion. What this examination was, is, or should be, he presumes not to say. For my part, I should be glad to know what the examination was, to which the Apostles subjected candidates for immersion. We hear much about examining candidates: I wish some one would show from Scripture what the examination should be. I know of nothing required by them, but some overt act, by which they openly declared their hearty disposition to acknowledge Jesus as Lord, indicating their full belief that he is the character he claims to be, and their wish to be his disciples. Philalethes talks about nominal* disciples; that is, disciples having the name; and seems to admit, they acquire the name in immersion. This, I think, is conceding a good deal. A body, without a name, is, I apprehend, in law, a nonentity, not known authoritatively to exist, can neither act, nor be the subject of action. So an unimmersed disciple, ("Christian,") if I may be allowed the expression,) that is, a disciple without the name, or without being named—in old style "*christened*," is no disciple at all—he may be prepared to be made a disciple; but a disciple he is not, until lawfully named. By the way, let not Philalethes suppose that I think the bare circumstance of being immersed can make a disciple. No; far from it. We have heard much said about the "*fruits meet* for repentance," which John required of candidates for *his immersion;* and *his* is called "the immersion of repentance," &c. But what were these fruits? Were they fruits ascertained to exist by an examination into the previous lives of the candidates, or was it simply a confession of sins, or being sinners? It is said in one place, "They were immersed confessing their sins." I apprehend from all I can learn from the New Testament, the fruits consisted in the confession of sins, with such external appearance of sincerity as was exhibited at the time. We hear too, in our days, of fruits meet for repentance; and I admit we ought to ask for all that was called for by the Apostles. Did they consist of any thing more than a professed hearty belief in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God, accompanied with the manifestation of a disposition *immediately to commence a hearty obedience to him in all things?* I have assumed the name of Inquirer, not merely for the sake of a name: I do profess in earnest to be an inquirer, and if Philalethes has any light to bestow from Scripture on the subject, I beseech him to bestow it. He says, "No person, for example, can be considered as bound to perform the act of immersion before he has performed *many other acts* prescribed by God." Now what these "many other acts" are, I beg him to particularize. I know there are previous acts to be performed: we must hear the word of the Lord—we must believe and also repent—and we are required to manifest the sincerity of this repentance by a prompt obedience; and the first thing required to be done, is to be immersed *in the name of the Lord.* Really, it appears to me the difficulty of being prepared for immersion is represented to be so great, and so many things to be perform-

**I observe he says "nominal Christians"—no matter, I suppose he means the same.*

ed, that we can hardly expect many "little children" to be prepared to perform the act of immersion. Finally, upon this point, I would ask, Can a person who feels it his duty to obey the Lord Jesus, and is also willing and desirous to obey him, be unprepared to perform the act of immersion, provided he knows it to be his duty to be immersed?

I beg Philalethes will not be offended at my suggesting that he is an old man and a Scotchman. I declare I did not use these as terms of reproach or ridicule. I do feel it my duty to pay respect to grey hairs, and their being on the head of a Scotchman does not at all diminish this feeling of respect—nay, it rather enhances this feeling. His being a Scotchman rather adds to his weight of character with me. To the Scotch the world is much indebted. Neither did I intend (if it had that appearance) "to dismiss with a sneer the distinction which Philalethes has made between the terms *commission* and *command*." Had I expressed a preference for either term (although I did not think much about the difference) I should have given it to his choice.

It only remains for me to notice the manner in which Philalethes has got over what he is pleased to call "the inconsistency of Philalethes sentiments." And I cannot but think, that when he holds up to light the expressions "*God's own unadulterated, unmixed message*," and "blundering translation," applied to this *very same* message, he must still see inconsistency, covered as they are by paint of a different color, which he has spread over them. If he knew that our common version was worthy of terms of exception so strong as he has used, and in the conviction in which he has used them—viz. the case of an individual who professed to be "engaged in trying to lead his fellow-creatures to subjection to the Saviour of sinners," using as the instrument this "unadulterated, unmixed message," an instrument which he himself had commended in terms so emphatic; I say, if he knew this, why did he use these terms? Sir, does Philalethes mean to say, that no person unacquainted with Greek and Hebrew, should venture to talk to his fellow creatures on the subject of immersion or baptism, and to express his conceptions of the action to be performed in submitting to it, and of the import of the institution to those who do submit to it? If we are not to rely upon translation, we are in a sad condition; for we have none among us who have the Scriptures in any other way—none who use the Greek and Hebrew languages as their mother tongue: even our erudite friend and brother is indebted to translation for his knowledge of the Scriptures. How comes he possessed of the meaning of a Greek word, but by translation? Does his lexicon more for him than to furnish him with a translation; and can he as a teacher of Christianity do more for those whom he instructs, than furnish them with a translation? Aye, and does he "venture to assure his fellow-creatures that *he* is publishing to them God's message, and nothing but God's message?" If he does, I can assure him he ventures upon more than I have ever heard our brother John do. I have never known him make assertions so bold and sweeping; he is too modest to assume so much. Sir, there are bounds in things; there is a point beyond and on this side which right cannot be:—and

if Philalethes has not gone beyond the right point, in speaking of translations, and of Greek and Hebrew, I labor under considerable misconceptions. Will Philalethes assert that the candid, unprejudiced reader of our common version cannot learn from it all that it is needful for him to know and practise; or that one who wishes to lead his fellow-creatures to the Saviour of sinners, cannot find in this "blundering translation" the instructions necessary to be imparted? By the way, he ought to be informed that John professes not to be a clergyman.

I believe I have now said all that was upon my mind on this subject, except to repeat my assurance to Philalethes that I have no wish to wound his feelings, and to beg him not to take any thing herein written as dictated by any feelings of hostility to him. I did think a wrong construction had been placed upon his essay on "*matheteuo*;" I had long thought so, and I took the liberty of expressing this conviction. And I cannot but think, that upon mature reflection, he will see that he went too far in his "strictures on John," when speaking of that very translation which he had himself so strongly recommended. I pretend not to vie with him in him in point of erudition, nor would I enter into a grave controversy with him in any matter in which we should have to range widely in the fields of literature.

Yours in the Lord,

INQUIRER.

Remarks on Dr. Cleland's No. 7.

NO. III.

Mr. CLELAND, like the scuttle-fish in danger of its enemy, has muddied the water by a discharge of the most atrabilious scurrility. His No. 7. now lying before me, than which a more impotent and vulgar document has not lately appeared, even from the licensed retailers of political abuse, exhibits a pravity rarely excelled by any of the hoary veterans in the crusade for orthodoxy. When argument fails this has usually been the resort of knaves; but we expected better things from this revered Pastor of ancient Presbyterianism.

The Editor of this paper, among the numerous analogies and illustrations submitted to the candid reader, indicative of the design of Christian immersion, always gave a preference to those found in the Christian Scriptures; amongst which birth, circumcision, marriage, citizenship, death, burial, resurrection, are most conspicuous. But these were always used as *illustrations*—not as *arguments*. It is admitted that there is some argument in well selected analogies, especially when these have been introduced by infallible teachers, and not carried beyond the obvious limits; but these are not with us the grounds of reliance. We rely upon the unfigurative and positive declarations of the Holy Spirit, that great advocate and pleader for Messiah

We have, however, used no other declarations, and expatiated on no other analogies than those unequivocally asserted in the Christian Scriptures. But for doing this—for using the words of Peter—we have been by Mr. Cleland accosted in the following courteous and gentlemanly style:—

"This successful patentee"—"of this wonderful invention"—"this moral mechanician"—"inventor of a watery machine"—"the safety valve"—"of this soul-chilling, heart-rending, new discovered institution"—"this wonder-working affair"—"this wonderful moral machinery."

These are the compliments of Mr. Cleland, bestowed on us for quoting Peter ii. 38. as understood by all the writers of note for *four centuries* after Christ, and as explained in most of the old standards of the modern sects. Thus this mild and dignified father of the Kentucky Synod—this very spiritual metaphysician and advocate of metaphysical regeneration, honors us.

But for using the analogies introduced by Jesus, and expatiated upon by himself, John, Peter, and Paul, I allude to the analogies of "being begotten," "born again, &c.—we are told that "it is impious, irreverent, and blasphemous"—"the cheek of modesty must redden at the sight of such gross analogies, and immodest representations" — "this is a most urgent case of midwifery"—"his ministerial coadjutors will have the characteristic office and operation (of baptizing) of physico-theological midwifery."

Reader, is not this enough? These are not the words of a scolding and denouncing vagrant pedlar of divinity, but of the talented, aged, meek, and revered Dr. Cleland of Kentucky. But you say, 'Why complain of all this? Mr. Cleland knows what best suits the spiritual taste of his own parish and people, as he helped to form that taste, and ought he not to be allowed to minister to its gratification? His parochial address compliments the judgment of his brethren; and you know what is clownish in one company is courteous in another. Mr. Cleland doubtless is the best judge of what is courteous and polite in the high circles of Presbyterians, amongst which he shines as a star of the first magnitude!'

After excepting a few assertions which he will never prove, the marrow and fatness of his number *Seven* is couched in the above specimens—all the rest is skin and bone. He affirms that "the philogical mistakes of Drs. Campbell and Macknight on the translation of the word *baptism* (by *immersion*) have been long ago detected and exposed." By whom?——Dr. Cleland, I suppose! He may tell this story to his congregation at home, from the *sacred desk*, or by the fire side, but he ought to fear the assertion of it abroad; for he will as soon prove that every student in Kentucky is as great a master of eloquence as Demosthenes himself, as the above assertion.

I will state but one fact on this subject—and I can call it a *fact* in the full sense of the word; and that one fact forever puts it out of the power of Dr. Cleland to prove his assertion. The fact is this,

times in the Christian Scriptures, neither King James' FIFTY FOUR translators, nor any Greek Lexicon in England or America, did even *once* translate the word *bapto* nor any of its family by the words *sprinkle* or *pour*. No translator, ancient or modern—no classic dictionary, not even Parkhurst, in all the meanings of *bapto* or *baptizo*, translate it to *sprinkle* or *pour*. The King's translator's have three times translated it to *dip;* and this, with their never translating it by *sprinkle* or *pour*, will make it a hard task for Dr. Cleland to redeem his pledge.

He almost repudiates Drs. Campbell and Macknight from his brotherhood, (worthy, indeed, to be repudiated, for their honesty, from such an alliance,) because they dared to defend *immersion* as the legitimate and unequivocal meaning of *baptisma*.

If the Presbyterians did not revere Dr. Cleland, I would offer a long apology to my readers for the quotations which I have made from this Number *Seven*. Such vulgarisms coming from any other quarter, should not have been printed on these pages. Has it, indeed, come to this, that because the Saviour declared that "unless a man be born again," "born of water and Spirit," "he cannot enter into his kingdom," that every professed Christian who uses this analogy, or quotes these words, must be held up as immodest, irreverent, and blasphemous—and that those who *immerse* must be tauntingly called from the "*sacred desks*" "physico-theological midwives!" Tell it not to the disciples of Thomas Paine, the admirers of Hume, Volney, and Voltaire, that the Rev. Dr. Cleland of Kentucky did publish in Elder Skilman's *Western* LUMINARY, in Lexington, Ky. Sept. 12, 1832, such a slander upon the figures, analogies, and words of the Great Teacher sent from God, and of his holy Apostles!

There is not one sentiment, which we avow, assaulted in the above number. It is all a forgery throughout. We never taught the doctrines which he ascribes to us. The same management of the words of the Apostle Paul will make him say the most absurd things:—"Behold I, Paul, say to you, if you be circumcised," "you shall be saved;" "for every one that is circumcised" "has the remission of his sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified." These are all words of Paul, but not in this connexion. Thus Mr. Cleland has tortured my essays.

If Jacob Creath, Senr. and other proclaimers of the apostolic institutions, do not cease to labor on the borders of Dr. Cleland, he ought to complain of them to the Grand Jury, or have them sent to the Lunatic Asylum, rather than pour forth such a flood out of his mouth over all the land of Kentucky, until it has ascended up the Ohio, even to Bethany.

There are yet five Nos. of Dr. Cleland's most learned analysis of C——m, or rather his ingenius defences of Presbyterianism; from some of which, as Sampson found some honey in the dead carcase of a lion, we may extract a few grains of edification—if, indeed, an expose of such errors and manœuvres can be edifyfng to any one.

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

PULASKI, WEST TENNESSEE, October 29, 1832.

To Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia.

Respected Sir:—

I MUST desire you to believe, that neither suggestions of vanity, nor sentiments of irreverence for the genuine spirit of the christian religion, have any participation in the motives which dictate this communication. Attentive perusals of those of your writings which have fallen under my notice; the favorable opinions I have been morally compelled to form of those writings, and the doctrines they are intended to support; to say nothing of my impressions respecting the intellectual character of the writer, induce me to state to you, with *entire candor*, some of those prominent, and to me yet insurmountable difficulties, which present themselves against an implicit confidence in the authenticity of all the doctrines of the christian religion. I am not the only person interested in an explicit and condensed commentary on the statements which are subjoined; thousands, perhaps *millions*, in every christian country of magnitude and intelligence, are surrounded by the same obstructive, and, to them, invincible barriers to implicit faith in the doctrines of christianity, which I, sir, am compelled to acknowledge—and especially that *christianity* which manifests itself under such a *multiplied variety of creeds*, many of which, instead of affording consolations to mankind, under the pressure of innumerable calamities, seem to involve the hopes and destinies of the whole human race in contradiction, mysticism, and impenetrable obscurity.

I do not wish you to refer me to the records of your public debates for the desired information; it is possible that the umpires who presided, occupied the judgment-seat with preconcieved and dogmatical opinions: and you cannot be a stranger to the important truth, that among the generality of mankind, OPINIONS on nearly all subjects are formed in the *first instance*, and ARGUMENTS *afterwards sought for* to support them. This process seems to me to be fraught with innumerable mischiefs to the cause of *truth;* it seems to be at open war with the cool and deliberative exercises of *reason*—and, is probably productive of more dissensions in opinion among men, than they are willing to acknowledge. In many of those popular conflicts, you have been compelled to reply to captious, and often puerile objections, not unfrequently beneath the dignity of rational consideration, urged and reiterated by those who reason from their prejudices and passions, argue without acknowledged and established facts, and who are often found to raise the shout of triumph, without having obtained the victory.

First. Why are there so many, and such greatly diversified religious creeds among men; whilst *reason*, and the *great interests* of mankind, would seem to require but *one religion*, capable of embracing the welfare of the whole human race?

Second. Why do the votaries of nearly all these creeds, claim the exlusive privilege of being the chosen flock of heaven; always in the right, and never erring in opinion, to the exclusion of all others from *divine mercy*, who may chance to differ with them in principles and practice—especially considering, that those others are *equally rational* with themselves, *equally interested* in discovering and embracing the truth, *equally created* by the Almighty fiat, and *equally susceptible* of happiness and misery?

Third. Why do most of these narrow sectarians, of whom I have just spoken, dare to profess *charity* to all mankind, and "on earth *peace* and *good will* towards men," and at the same time breathe a *spirit of vengeance* against those who cannot *conscientiously* embrace their doctrines:—especially considering, that those they *doom to destruction* are their fellow-beings, are equally unfortunate with themselves, and are seeking the *right path* with a *candor*, *perseverance*, and *avidity* equal to their own?

Fourth. Why dare these sectarians, in the face of their own professions of faith, in the face of reason, mercy, justice and humanity, impiously attempt to wrest the high prerogative of judgment from the lofty and *unerring tribunal of Heaven*, and to sit as *umpires* between *man* and his MAKER!

Fifth. Let it be supposed, to show the impious absurdity of such professions as have just been set forth, that the doctrines of any *one religious sect* were to be made the rule of *judgment* and *condemnation* by the Almighty, at the GREAT DAY OF ACCOUNTS—and, I would ask these *exclusive* sectarians, what would be the awful condition of countless millions of the human race, who would have existed between the commencement and the termination of time?—Here, sir, all arithmetical computations, as to *numbers*, absolutely fail; and all the boasted powers of the human imagination sink and expire, in attempting to grasp so vast, so unbounded a spectacle of human misery and ruin!

Sixth. But let us take these exclusive and inhuman sectarian doctrines a little further: let us admit, according to the Mosaical account, that the world is nearly six thousand years old; let us also admit, and it is said to accord with philosophic calculation, that ten human beings are *born*, and that ten *die*, in *every second of time:*—here, as before, all numerical calculations seem to come short of the aggregate number of human beings who have been born, and who have died, in the long period of six thousand years, allowing *ten* for every second of time. But this is not all. There are probably, at this present time, a population of between *ten* and *eleven hundred millions* of inhabitants on the globe. Now I would ask these sectarians, who consign all mankind to destruction but themselves, what proportion does the *aggregate* of all the Christians now on earth, bear to the *immense population* of the whole globe? Let these *charitable* followers of Christ cast their eyes over the immense nations which inhabit the great continents of Africa and Asia, and tell me how many Christians, of any *possible denominations*, can be found among the numerous and

and powerful nations of those continents? Next, let them turn their eyes to the continents of Europe and America; and, after taking a deliberate survey of their whole population, including those savage and barbarous nations to whom even the *name of Christ is yet unknown*, tell me how many, out of the vast population of these two immense regions, are professors of religion *in any Christian shape.* Accurate calculations, on these interesting subjects, would probably have the merciful effect of bursting the fetters of narrow sectarian prejudices asunder—and of assigning to man, no matter of what color, of what climate, or what distant and benighted region of the globe, that rank in the *mercy* and *affections* of the GREAT CREATOR of the Universe, to which he is and must be entitled, (or I am mistaken,) by the principles of unerring and eternal justice! Next, let those sectarians take into consideration, particularly as regards their *own dissensions* in belief,—1st. That truth is ONE. 2d. That their BELIEFS are DISCORDANT. And 3d. That but *one* of all the religious sects existing CAN BE RIGHT. And then let them exhibit, according to their own *exclusive doctrines*, what would be the afflicting spectacle presented to them at THE GREAT DAY OF ACCOUNTS, were the Almighty to adopt but *one* of all their numerous and conflicting *creeds*, as the rule of his final decision? I speak it without impiety, or irreverence for the great principles of the Christian religion—which no man in his senses can treat with indignity—that they would behold an *abortive*, though *divine* scheme of redemption, for their miserable race; they would see the *regions of the damned peopled with countless myriads of their fellow-beings—a Universe in ruins*—and an *almost* SOLITARY GOD!! —These, sir, seem to me to be facts and inferences too plain for the subterfuges of sophistry—too strong for even sectarian prejudices—and too stubborn for either *denial* or *evasion.*

Amidst all the sectarian doctrines which pervade the world—amidst the vast and complicated variety of religious opinions diffused among mankind, opinions which have led to *martyrdom* for the support of nearly *every cause*—what is he to believe who seeks *order* among such *chaos; truth* among such *contradictions;* and *safety* among *bitter* and *reciprocal* denunciations of *vengeance* against unbelief, and even against *dissension in opinion?* These are some of the difficulties I experience in the selection and adoption of any particular code of Christian faith; these are some of the prominent reasons why I have hitherto been, and still am compelled, though reluctantly, to reject all the merely sectarian codes with which I have become acquainted. To me they seem to stand on too *narrow* and *exclusive*, not to say *uncharitable* and *misanthropic* foundations, to embrace that enlarged and boundless beneficence of Heaven, which we see every where displayed, for the *benefit of man*, in the visible Universe! No *one* of them, that I am acquainted with, can be so charitably extended as to embrace the present and future destinies of the *whole human race:* and I cannot, if I even desired it, subscribe to the truth of any religious creed which comes short of this. Individuals and nations, of whatever country or remote climate, seem to me to be equally the

offspring of one GREAT and UNIVERSAL PARENT; equally the objects of *attention* and *tenderness* with that Parent, throughout every region of the habitable globe. He has surely bestowed on the whole race of man the same physical organization, the same susceptibilities of pain and pleasure, of happiness and misery; and although he seems to have imposed *religious conditions* on the whole human race, as well as *moral ones*, which carry with them penalties for disobedience, of no ordinary magnitude; yet even these religious conditions and moral penalties, it would seem to me, are certainly regulated not by *caprice* and *partiality*, but by principles of reason and unerring justice!

But, sir, I have other objections to mere sectarian codes. It seems to me that the proofs usually adduced in support of them are founded on the *mere antiquity* of certain dogmas, generated in the night of time and the infancy of nations; on the *prejudices* of early precept and example, which always substitute *mere authority* for what ought to be *rational evidence;* on *forced constructions* of detached portions of Scripture; and, if I may be allowed the negative expression, on the *want* of that moral and intellectual intrepidity, possessed indeed by few, which leads to *profound investigation*, not *subsequently*, but *anterior* to the adoption of opinions. With me, in religion as in politics, and in the words of the great patriot Sidney, "Implicit faith belongs to fools; truth is comprehended by examining proofs, as the foundation of principles." No man can believe what he pleases, or even what he wishes; I mean no rational and unprejudiced man. No man can believe, if his belief be rational, that two and two make five; that a straight line occupies the longest distance between two points; or that the sun and moon appear triangular. A man, it seems to me, must believe according to the strength of the evidence presented to his reasoning powers; and, I think, it would be as difficult for an unprejudiced and intelligent man to *avoid believing* on sufficient evidence, as it would be for him to *believe implicitly* without any evidence at all. In fact, I know of no such thing as *faith*, by which I here mean *entire belief*, that is not founded on testimony calculated to carry irresistible conviction to the human mind; and, until the principles of narrow and exclusive sectarianism are better supported than I think they are at present, I must continue to defer a selection from among them of any particular code. I wish to witness the establishment or adoption of some religious faith and practice, on rational, charitable, and beneficent foundations—capable of embracing the *whole human race*, and of doing ample justice to those sublime attributes of the DEITY, which we denominate *wisdom, justice, mercy, divine love of the human family!* Exclusive partialities cannot comport with the wisdom, the justice, and the *all-absorbing love* of the ALMIGHTY, for his feeble and erring creature, *man!* But it is time to conclude this portion of my letter:—and I will now state to you, with the same candor hitherto observed, my serious and solemn objections to the Mosaical account of the Creation, as it appears in the first book of Genesis, according to the present translation of the Bible.

"Say first, of GOD above, or *man* below—
"What can we *reason*, but from what *we know*?"

On every side of him, in the planetary system, in the depths of the ocean, and on the whole surface of the solid and habitable globe, man beholds an infinite assemblage of objects, which he denominates the physical universe. He sees the great planetary system, regulated by laws which never deviate; he distinguishes that the unfathomable depths of the ocean are pervaded by aquatic animals, and even growths of vegetation, which could no where else subsist, except in that unstable and tumultuous element, and that they are all subject to the same invariable laws; he sees the solid domains of the whole globe, embracing all the parallels of latitude and longitude, and every temperature of climate, from the frozen atmosphere of the poles to the burning rigors of the equatorial regions, covered with an infinity of *vegetable growths*, suited to those varied temperatures, and with almost countless *races of animals*, calculated also to exist under all those varied temperatures, and that all of them are subject to the supreme domination of equally immutable laws. Then, turning an eye of curiosity and wonder on himself, he beholds a *frame* exquisitely and astonishingly organized—*physical senses* fitted for the examination and rigid scrutiny of all objects which present themselves—and *intellectual powers* calculated to hold dominion over every thing around him; and he easily distinguishes that this frame and its exquisite organic structures, these physical senses and their capacities, and these intellectual powers, so varied and extensive in their genius and energies, are all subject to the influence and government of laws, equally unchangeable, and equally beyond his control! Hence, in my opinion, sir, first arose among mankind the idea of a GOD, self-dependent and supreme—the origin of all things—THE GREAT CREATOR OF THE UNIVERSE.

The immense, and to us unbounded machinery of the physical universe; the steady and unerring revolutions of the great planetary system, which produce for man the changes of the seasons; the periods of seed-time and harvest, and all the vast phenomena of vegetable life; the unchangeable relations or laws, which pervade and regulate the great system of nature, through all her departments of vegetable, animal, and intellectual existence—in fact, all objects of which the human mind can take cognizance, demonstrate conclusively to the rational faculties of man, and to the exercise of his best judgment, not only the existence of a GOD, autocratical and supreme, but also that this great *being* must possess infinity of wisdom, omnipotence of power, and perfection of design:—*infinity of wisdom to* PLAN; *omnipotence of power to* CREATE *and* SUSTAIN; and *unerring perfection of design to produce and perpetuate* EVERLASTING HARMONY, not only in the great system of nature, measurably known to us, but in the sublime, and to us incomprehensible evolutions of A UNIVERSE WITHOUT BOUNDS!

"That very *law** which moulds a tear,
And bids it trickle from its source:
That law preserves the earth a sphere,
And binds the planets to their course!"

* *Gravity.*

But, to be a little less general:—We distinguish the *glory* of GOD in the visible beauties and magnificent splendors of created nature; his *omnipotent power* in the support and perpetuation of all the departments of animated nature known to us, from the life and organization of the vegetable of the fields and woods, up to the complicated organization and superior vitality of man; his *infinity of wisdom* in the fitness or co-aptation of each portion of his great works, however minute, to all we can comprehend of those works: and we can certainly be at no loss to observe INFINITE PERFECTION OF DESIGN in all natural objects cognizable by our senses, our understandings, and our reasoning powers, so far as the grand design of *creation* and *Providence* can be developed by the feeble and limited energies of man. The truth is, sir, that these attributes of an almighty and unerring God, are as visible in the analysis of a physical atom, or even the chemical compounds of a rock, as in the complicated and exquisite structure and vitality of the human frame—or the immutable and infinitely harmonious laws which regulate the great movements of the universe!

Amidst this great and glorious assemblage of natural objects, subjected to the same invariable and infinitely harmonious laws, man seems to stand conspicuous and alone. He is the only being, absolutely known to himself, capable of raising his contemplations to the *Deity*, and of experiencing a sentiment of awe, veneration, and devotional love for the unknown author of his existence—the only being in creation, known to his perceptive and rational powers, whose mental capacities are capable of embracing the wide horizon of *physical nature and her laws*—and of experiencing a sublime and comprehensive *sentiment of* IMMORTALITY. With all these immense capacities and powers, and endowed with sensitive and mental energies, which have laid open to his genius for enterprize the *geography* of the whole globe which he inhabits; which have disclosed to him the vast and apparently unlimited boundaries of the oceans and the land, and conducted him through trackless and tumultuous seas to distant and unknown coasts, scarcely yet found in delineation on the mariner's chart; which have taught him to measure and calculate, by the aid of the magnetic needle, the unerring principles of mathematics, and the science of numbers, not only the solid surface of the globe he inhabits, but the relative distances and locations of all the planetary objects embraced by the great science of astronomy; which have enabled him, by the subduing and destructive power of his war-like inventions, to subjugate or destroy, and hold undivided dominion over all the inferior orders of animated nature; which have taught him the exercise and principles of all the mechanic arts, and enabled him to clothe his body with attire, to shield it from the frosts and snows of winter, and the sultry and oppressive heats of summer; to raise sheds to cover and ramparts to defend himself against his natural enemies—in fine, to conquer nearly all the objects which stand in the way of his *enjoyments* and *happiness*:—can it it be possible, sir, that *man*, thus nobly endowed, and thus most exquisitely

organized, physically and intellectually, should have been placed by his Maker in a *garden*, merely "*to dress it, and to keep it?*"—"And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And the Lord took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, *to dress it and to keep it.*"

The laws of nature, at least to me, sir, speak in a voice not easily to be misunderstood. Our first parents must have been formed physically, morally, and mentally, precisely like ourselves, or I think they could not have been our progenitors: throughout all animated existence, as far as I can judge, *like produces like.* If they were invested with *organic procreative powers*, those endowments could not have been bestowed in vain: to presume otherwise, would be virtually to impeach infinite wisdom with folly: if given, they were to be exercised—"And God said unto them, be *fruitful*, and *multiply*, and *replenish* the earth, and *subdue* it," &c.—and if exercised, the difficulty with me is, was the garden of Eden capacious and productive enough to afford ample room for, and to furnish with subsistence, the whole race of Adam? But, even suppose that the garden of Eden were made to embrace the whole habitable surface of the globe, would even that vast domain have afforded space and subsistence for such a race as must have now been in existence, had not Adam fallen, and the curse of *death* been denounced against the countless myriads of his race? If Adam was not intended to procreate his species, his prolific energies must have been bestowed in vain, and the whole inhabitable globe, except the small space occupied by himself and his partner, who must also have been doomed to perpetual barrenness, must have remained a wild and uncultivated desert, and left eternally to the undivided empire of inferior animals. But this state of things, according to the Bible itself, seems not to have been the intention of the Creator—for Adam and Eve were commanded, even previously to their fall, as well as I can understand the requisition, to "increase and multiply, and to replenish the earth, and to subdue it." In fine, the whole of my difficulties respecting the correctness of the Mosaical account of creation, may be comprised in the following queries:—Was it intended by the ALMIGHTY Creator that our first parents and their innumerable progeny were to confine their whole attention and wonderful energies merely to the cultivation and dressing of a garden? Was that garden circumscribed to definite and unsurmountable bounds, or were its environs the ends of the earth, the circumference of the whole globe? In either case, and supposing that man had not fallen, by which fall alone we are taught that *death* came into the world, would there at this day have been room for the numerous race of our first parents in the garden, or even on the surface of the globe? If, on the contrary, those original parents were not invested with procreative powers; or, if endowed therewith, were doomed to perpetual barrenness, was the earth forever to continue an uncultivated wilderness, the undisputed and undivided empire of wild beasts? Did the introduction of *death* into the world, by the *fall of man*, change the original conformation of the jaws of carnivorous animals, and make the earth,

and the rivers, and the oceans of the globe, theatres of robbery, carnage, and bloodshed? In fine, did the original sin of Adam make the earth bring forth thorns, and briars, and noxious weeds—many, if not all of which, are calculated for the cure of the diseases of our race? And did that original sin produce all the physical, moral, and intellectual disorders, which we every where distinguish among mankind?

This communication, sir, has been made longer than at first intended; but, because I consider the subjects important which it embraces, and because it was written in obedience to the request of several of your readers, and my own ardent wish for information, I trust you will excuse some prolixity.

With due respect and consideration,

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES CASSEDY.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, &c.

☞[Reply in our next.]

FAITH---Confidence.

A VERY interesting discussion from a brother in Standford, Kentucky, was received some time since on the derivation and etymological import of the word πιστις, from πιστευω, *to believe*. Faith is, by us, usually defined "the belief of testimony" This is the definition of the *term*. The *thing* is, however, confidence in testimony—confidence in the person or thing testified. As a *Christian principle of action*, it is confidence in the Messiah, as revealed in the testimony of Apostles and Prophets. Having occupied so many pages on this term and the various definitions of it, we cannot think it expedient to occupy much room with this *element* of the Christian system.

The word *persuasion*, or *confidence*, fully represents the term *pistis*, faith, when viewed as a *principle of action*, or as exhibited in Hebrews xi. 1. I have just now opened Professor Stuart on this passage, and I am so well pleased with his remarks, that I shall give his translation of this verse and a part of his defence of it:—

"Now faith is confidence in respect to things hoped for, and convincing evidence of things not seen."

On ελεγχος, demonstration, proof, convincing evidence, he remarks—"The meaning is, that faith in the divine word and promises is equivalent to, or supplies the place of, proof or demonstration; in regard to the objects of the unseen world; i. e. it satisfies the mind respecting their reality and importance, as proof or demonstration is wont to do." But in speaking more in detail on this faith, he says in his work on the Hebrews, vol. 2, p. 254—

"That the faith here brought to view, and adverted to through chapter xi. is not *specifically* what some theologians call *saving faith*, viz. faith in Christ, in an appropriate and *limited* sense, is evident from the nature of the examples which are subjoined by the writer; e. g. verses 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, &c. In this chapter, faith is *belief* or *confidence* generally in divine declarations, of whatever nature they may be; for it does not always have respect even to *promises* or to the *future;* e. g. verse 3. Now the same confidence in what God declares, respecting subjects of such a nature as are brought to view in this chapter, would lead the person who exercises it, to confidence in all which God might declare respecting the Messiah, and consequently to belief in Christ. It is

then called, by theologians, *saving faith*. But it should be remembered, that this is only a convenient *technical* phrase of modern theology; not one employed by the sacred writers. The true and essential nature of faith, is *confidence in God, belief in his declarations*; and whether this be exercised by believing in the Scripture account of the creation of the world; or, as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, and others exercised it, in respect to specific objects; or, by believing on the Messiah; it is evidently *the same disposition of mind*, in all cases. It is *confidence in God*. It is, therefore, with perfect propriety, that our author here excites the Hebrews to persevere in their Christian faith, by various examples which exhibit the power of faith in the ancient worthies, as a principle of pious and virtuous belief and action."

This is the nighest approach to our views on faith as a *principle of action*, which we have yet met with in the works of the very learned and popular theologians of this age. Subtracting from this the idiomatic expressions of one deeply learned in the theological lore of the current age, and with the plain import of this reasoning we express a very cordial concurrence.

Faith, indeed, is the confidence of things hoped for; and the demonstration, or convincing evidence, of things not seen.

EDITOR.

New Year's Evening at Mr. Goodal's.

PROLOGUE.

Mr. and Mrs. GOODAL lived in the neighborhood of Earl Moira's Castle and the village of Newtonfields. They had reared a very numerous family, who, with the exception of Maria, (the youngest daughter,) had married and settled around the ancient homestead, which had been in the family for four generations. Since the marriage of their eldest daughter to Mr. Fowler, the old gentleman had made it a family institution, that on every New Year's day, all his children and their families should dine at his house, together with the Pastor of the church to which they all belonged. And as soon as his sons Thomas and William had taken to themselves wives, they, and the husbands of their elder sisters, according to age, had each successive evening the same company at their respective houses. Some Christian friends were always partakers of these feasts of natural affection; and the Christian graces consecrated these anniversaries to the Lord.

On one of these occasions, Mr. Williamson, the author of this narrative, had the good fortune, by a singular incident, to be present; and having felt himself much benefited by the conversation of that evening, and five other evenings, spent in a similar manner, in the same vicinity, he preserved in his sketch book, a faithful narrative not only of the topics of that evening, but of the others, so memorable in the history of his life.

Mr. Goodal, though a member of an Independent congregation, unassociated with any other in that country, did not fully harmonize with the views of his brethren: indeed, he had been a diligent and independent student of his Bible for forty years, and could not fully accord with any Christian community in the island. He was, in the true sense of the word, a *natural* and *moral* philosopher, without ever having read a volume on these subjects; and in the science of practical economy, he had no superior in the county of Down. He was, however, wholly a religious man; for he carried his religious principles into all the business of life; and in conversation scarcely a topic could be introduced which he would not, in a way peculiarly his own, consecrate to religion.

Having been favored with Mr. Williamson's sketch book, we have taken from it the details of the six evenings spent in the vicinity of Newtonfields during the first week of the year 1800; and will, in regular order, though in small parcels at a time, lay it before our readers:—

JANUARY 1, 1800.

Conversation before Dinner at Samuel Goodal's.

"A happy New Year," said Elder Reed, "on entering Mr. Goodal's parlor, "a happy New Year to Father and Mother Goodal, and all the guests under their hospitable roof!"

"And to Bishop Reed, his family, and flock," replied Father Goodal, taking him very affectionately by the hand, which he raised to his bosom.

"Let me introduce to you and the guests, Mr. Williamson," said the worthy Pastor, late from New York, "a remote relative of mine, whose recent misfortunes have brought him back to the land of his fathers. In my usual familiarity I induced him to accompany Mrs. Reed and myself to celebrate this New Year's evening with your family and relatives."

Mr. Goodal.—"Doubly welcome, because a child of misfortune and your relative, brother Reed. Mr. Williamson, be seated near me, as I wish for a more particular acquaintance."

The family and guests being introduced to each other and seated round the room, Father Goodal called upon his daughter Maria for a song suited to the occasion. Maria very gracefully sang the song which begins with the following verse—

"O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come;
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home."

After a pause, Father Goodal, turning to Mr. Reed, said, "Brother Reed, what do you think Paul meant by "*redeeming time*"? This command, you know, he delivered to two congregations—the Ephesians and Colossians."

Mr. Reed.—"I read this passage the other day in the Bishop's old Bible. They translate it in the imperative mood—"Redeem time!" And on the margin we find this note.—"Bestow the time well which the malice of men every where plucketh from you, and causeth you to abuse it."

Mr. Goodall.—"Very good sense, and a very good advice; but I am apprehensive that is not what the Apostle meant: for he connects it with "walk in wisdom to them that are without;" and to the Ephesians he adds, "because the days are evil."

Mr. Reed.—"And in Theodotian's version of Daniel ii. 8. the phrase is adopted by that Greek interpreter as equivalent to *protracting* time. If, then, we put the connecting phrases in Eph. v. 16. and Col. iv. 5. together, we may discover that this gaining or protracting of time, had reference to the enemies of Christianity—those without, and those who by their persecutions were making it an evil time, or days of evil, to the Christians. Then it would mean, "Walk in wisdom, or in all prudence, towards your opposing enemies; for then you will prolong your days of tranquility, by the prudence of your behaviour, not incensing them to persecution."

Mr. Goodall—"That meets my common sense view of the passage: for with me the connexion is always the best commentator."

Mr. Williamson.—"This touches my case. Inadvertence to that exhortation was the cause of all my misfortunes."

Mr. Goodal.—"How came that to pass?"

Mr. Williamson.—"My narrative would cast a shade over the occasion, and would engross too much time."

Mr. Goodall.—"If it illustrates the text, let us hear it: we will not have any special topic till after dinner:—a brief sketch, if you please, Mr. Williamson."

Mr. Williamson.—"To gratify you, I will relate a single incident which involved me in a train of misfortunes:—

"I was educated a Presbyterian, and for four years was a member of Dr. M—n's church, New York. The Doctor was a great man; but not acceptable

to me. I received no salutary information from him. After joining another congregation I became restless there also, and finally betook myself to the Bible. I knew not at first whether the fault was in me or in the preachers. I was easy in my circumstances, but unhappy in my mind. My employers, one a Presbyterian, the other an Episcopalian, very respectable and wealthy merchants, gave me a good birth and a handsome salary. But as my knowledge of the Scriptures increased, I became incensed at the clergy; and, instead of reforming myself, aimed at reforming them. My acrimonious remarks offended one of my employers who had married the Parson's sister, and I was censured for neglect of duty, though never more faithful to my engagements, and finally dismissed. From that moment till I left that city, one misfortune trode on the heels of another. Had I then walked prudently to those without, I might have been equally pious, and have protracted the time of my tranquility, and prevented many a pang which I have since suffered—not for righteousness sake."

Mr. Reed.—"There are many more persecuted now-a-days for *unrighteousness'* sake, than for righteousness' sake."

Mr. Goodal.—"I can never grieve with those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, because the Saviour commanded such to rejoice and be exceeding glad; but I can sympathize with those who are persecuted for what they think is righteousness. Therefore, Mr. Williamson, I can sympathize with you. But be of good cheer! If you love the Lord, the Lord will chasten and forgive you."

Mr. Williamson.—"This incident may suffice for the present as an example of the necessity of conducting ourselves with prudence to them who are without, as well as to those within, who differ from us."

Mr. Goodal—"I have heard many a woeful tale about persecution; but have known only one or two instances of persecution for *righteousness' sake.* I have generally observed some imprudence, some departure from the meek and quiet spirit of our Master—some insolence, acrimony, or contempt on the part of those who have cried out, "Persecution!"

Mr. Reed.—"This reminds me of an old lady who told me last Christmas what a cross she had to bear, and how painful it was. I asked her what it was. "Oh!" said she, "this mischievous tongue of mine—how hard to refrain from abusing my neighbors and domestics!"

Mr. Goodal.—"Yes, brother Reed, she, like many others, confounded self-denial with bearing a cross. She never learned that Jesus distinguished between denying one's self and taking up the cross."

Mr. Fowler.—"They are doubtless distinct, and not one and the same thing. But very few seem to understand that *bearing a cross* is a circumlocution for *persecution.* I had to instance this yesterday to my servant William, who was telling me what a cross he had to endure when he joined the Methodists, in abstaining from whiskey and tobacco."

Mr. Williamson.—"But may I ask Mr. Reed, how, in this state of self-denial and trials, Christians can *always* rejoice, as Paul so often commands?"

Mr. Reed.—"Paul's doctrine and experience agree. He could say, 'I am poor, naked, sorrowful; yet *always* rejoicing.' I have not, indeed, yet fully learned this lesson myself; but here is Father Goodal, whom I never saw dejected, and I think his experience would be edifying to us all.——Father Goodal, how is it that you are always so joyful?"

Mr. Goodal.—"I wish always to be *communicative,* in every sense of that social word, and will tell you an anecdote:—When a lad I read to my father the 12th chapter of Deuteronomy, merely as a sample of my improvement in the art of reading. I was struck with the 7th and 8th verses where Moses tells the nation that when they would be very exact in attending upon the institutions, they "would rejoice in all that they put their hand to." But when I came to the 12th verse, and read these words,—"*You shall rejoice before the Lord your God*; yourselves, your sons and daughters, your men-servants and your maid-servants"—I was so overwhelmed that I had to stop and ask my

father, how could people REJOICE BEFORE THE LORD GOD. I thought they ought to *fear and tremble.* He seemed as confounded as myself, and said that all good people were happy, and that all happy people rejoiced. From that moment I wished to be good that I might *rejoice before the Lord.* Nor was I satisfied till I obtained that knowledge of God which enabled me to apprehend how I might always rejoice in his presence.

"Before I arrived at manhood I did not find a Christian family that rejoiced before the Lord in every thing they put their hand to. Thought I, certainly the Christian religion ought at least to make us as joyful in the Lord, as Moses with his fiery law. I resolved that I should never be satisfied with a religion that fell short of this. This excited me to read, and to inquire of my seniors for instruction in this matter. But the more I knew of the religious world, the less faith I had in its views of Christianity, because I saw that it failed of the fruits of even the religion of Moses. The Jewish lawgiver describes a feast as *a rejoicing before the Lord for seven days*; and old Habbakuk sings, "Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vine; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no food; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there be no herd in the stalls; yet I will rejoice in the Lord, and joy in the God of my salvation!" This was the religion which I sought, and I bless the Lord I found it before I found my beloved Sarah who sits by my side; and she yet remembers the day I asked her, though more than forty years ago, if she could give her heart to the man who could say with Isaiah, "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord; my soul shall be joyful in my God: for he has clothed me with the garments of salvation; he has covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decks himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorns herself with her jewels." Since that day I can say, that I have rejoiced before the Lord, and in the Lord, with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

Mr. Reed.—"Father Goodal, but do you not sometimes grieve for losses and disappointments?"

Mr. Goodal.—"Suppose a man possessed the wealth of all the Indies, think you he would mourn for the loss of a *guinea?* So I estimate all losses, afflictions, and trials as nothing—

"God is the treasure of my soul,
The source of lasting joy;
A joy which want shall not impair,
Nor death itself destroy."

Mr. Fowler.—"But, Father Goodal, will you tell us how you began to rejoice?"

Mr. Goodal.—"The love of God in the gift and sacrifice of his Son, first moved my heart. My heart immediately led me to walk in his commandments. Then I found the great reward. It was in obedience that Israel rejoiced, that Jesus rejoiced, that Paul and the early Christians rejoiced in the Lord."

Mr. Reed.—"There are not a few Christians, as we call them, who regard such joy as incompatible with our present circumstances and duties. For my part I am with you in theory, and I should rejoice to be with you in practice."

Mr. Goodal.—"I once heard you say, there is no joy in theory; for joy dwells in the heart and not in the head. And for that saying I thanked you."

Mr. Reed.—"It is a truth: for when the heart is surfeited with anxious cares, or with the pleasures of this life, and the lusts of other things, the justness of our theory will not eradicate these roots of bitterness."

Mr. Goodal.—"Pure joy is a fruit that grows only on the Tree of Life in the Paradise of God; and therefore the fulness of joy is only found in the presence of God, at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore."

Mr. Fowler.—"But how far have we strayed from the first topic?"

Mr. Williamson.—"I thought my tale of woe would change the theme; but I regret not that I have told it. If I could get rid of my anxious cares, I could figure to my mind some prospect of happiness. I could then think of joy."

Mr. Goodal.—"Well, after dinner we may find something that will suit your case. To heal the broken-hearted was a chief item in the Messiah's commission."

Mrs. Goodal.—"There is a time for every thing; and now the dinner waits."

Mr. Goodal.—"With gladness and singleness of heart, let us then, my dear, partake of it."

EDITOR.

Religious Inconsistency.

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, December 17, 1832.

Dear Brother Campbell,

I AM frequently reminded of an apology made by a worthy brother, for a congregation, that he had been laboring to convince of the necessity of obeying the gospel. After he had ceased to speak, the congregation were earnestly exhorted to obey, by another brother, but none came forward; whereupon I arose and observed, that, as a stranger, I could judge of the congregation in but two ways: first, that they had all obeyed the gospel, and that there were no sinners among them; or, if there were, that they did not know it. Upon which, the first mentioned brother arose and observed, that he had proved the world to be *a bundle of contradictions;* that he had once preached universal salvation to them, and they found fault—he now preached obedience to them, and they still found fault.

We Reformers say that God works by means, but are not making the necessary exertions—the Populars say that the Holy Spirit does the work, and they are making every exertion. Those who say that man can do nothing, employ all the men they can to carry on the work—we who say that faith comes by *hearing*, doubt the necessity of proclaiming. So we go! When will men learn to be consistent?

In haste, Yours, &c.

M. WINANS.

THE WORLD'S A BUNDLE OF CONTRADICTIONS!

I recently looked over the contents of a paper called "The Cross," printed in Frankfort, Ky. in which it is written:

"In a sound form of doctrine, we do not hesitate to say that these doctrines, *Election, Particular Atonement, Irresistible Grace in Conversion, Justification by Faith*, and *Perseverance of the Saints*, are indispensable."

But in another part of the same paper, I see *Camp Meetings* strongly advocated, by a writer who signs his name *A. W. Clopton*; from which I am led to make the inquiry, whether camp meetings be the means appointed of God *to elect*, &c.? If these be the means appointed, when was the appointment made, and where can it be found? I presume the writer would be understood to say, that by *camp meetings* much good may be done: viz. many may be elected, irresistibly converted, justified by faith, &c.

When reading, I was forcibly struck with the analogy between *camp meetings* and other *elections;* and although we read of no *camp meetings* among the primitive christians, yet there were a great many in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, at which time three thousand were elected.

We read, also, that the Jews used to have *camp meetings*, once every year. They being an *elect people*, whether any were elected at these meetings, is not mentioned.

Another difficulty has just occurred to me. If the general election took place before the foundation of the world, (as some will have it,) where the use of these camp meetings? But, from the *warmth* of Mr. Clopton in recommending *camp meetings*, I conclude that he does not give in to the *notion* that the election is past, although that *notion* is attributed to the denomination of which he is a member.

The major part of christians (I think) agree that the *gospel* is the means appointed of God, in the Reign of his Son, for collecting the subjects of his kingdom. Then, as the gospel was to be made known, or proclaimed, before it is believed; and as it cannot be obeyed before it is understood and believed; as *camp meetings* have a tendency to bring people together, they are, in this our day, a good substitute for *miracles*, by which (last) means many were collected in the days of our Lord and his Apostles,* and when collected they were taught, and many turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to the livtng God.

I have put in the best plea I can in favor of *camp meetings*, and if it meet the approbation of Mr. Clopton, he shall be welcome to the use of it. M. W.

DOCTORATES.

ON the catalogue of Yale College are the names of about 120 ministers who have received the doctorate, and fifty laymen. Of the laymen, the only persons that have borne the title of Doctor, are Benjamin Franklin and William Samuel Johnson, second President of the College in New York. Of the ministers thus complimented, only one has ever failed of wearing the title in common life. Even where the degree conferred is a doctorate of laws, if it is a minister that receives it, he always wears the title of Doctor. This looks as if ministers were more tickled with such baubles than intelligent laymen. Ministers, too, customarily receive the honor much younger than laymen. The youngest graduate of Yale College that has received the doctorate of laws, is John C. Calhoun, Vice President of the United States, who graduated in 1804. Still he is nothing but plain *Mr.* and every body would stare to hear one speak of *Doctor* Calhoun!

When the proposal was made in the late General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to erase these titular distinctions from the Minutes of that body, it was soon manifest that there was such an extreme sensitiveness as precluded the possibility of going at all into the merits of the case. So it was voted down for the sake of peace. Two Synods have adopted the rule—those of Kentucky, and the Western Reserve. [*Cor. of the N. Y. Evangelist.*]

*I do not say that our Lord and his Apostles wrought miracles for the purpose of exciting curiosity, and bringing people together. They did it to prove their divine mission, and to produce faith in those who heard them proclaim the gospel.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Number II.——Volume IV.

Bethany, Va. February, 1833.

THE PROPHECIES.

THE attentive reader will have discovered before to-day, with what caution we have spoken on the prophecies and millennial matters. Among the causes of this the following is chief:—We felt some misgivings in the most popular theories of interpretation; and, although prepossessed in favor of that system which flattered us with the expectation that the moral machinery about to operate, and which was operating upon the world, would usher in the glorious day, supported by the vials of God's wrath on an apostate church; we were involuntarily almost borne forward into another, and entirely different system of interpretation. Between these conflicting winds we thought it presumptuous to weigh anchor and launch upon the mighty deep. For the last five or six years we have been waiting for fair winds and a serene sky, and cannot yet say that the prospects are such as to authorize us to tempt the vast abyss. But here comes a bold adventurer, who is determined to make the voyage at all hazards. As he seems destined for the same port, we shall help him to put to sea; and as he appears to sail by the same stars, if he can brave the mighty dangers and get safe to land, we shall hail him as the most fortunate of modern adventurers.

Figures apart, we shall give this brother a fair hearing; for he deserves it! This we say, not because we may agree in the main propositions of his essay; but because he speaks like a *man*, and because the subject deserves more profound attention than any other, except it be the personal remission of sins. We may add a note occasionally, but he shall be permitted to tell his own story in his own way.

EDITOR.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'Corkle, *a Layman.*

To the Reader.

I HAVE no party interest to promote—will never have. I do firmly believe (from prophecy and "the signs of the times") the world to be approaching the most eventful period, the most important crisis, ever known since time began. The world, and especially the church, is to be a theatre of the most tremendous judgments—famine, war, pestilence, and fire! Silence is guilt.

The following points we propose briefly to examine:—

That no dispensation or government has ever been renovated after becoming corrupt.

That the present dispensation, committed to the Gentiles, has become corrupt—is to go into dissolution.

That no dispensation has ever lasted more than two thousand years.

That the Millennium, or Christ's Universal Reign, is to be a new dispensation.

That Christ is to make a second advent into the world, to be seen by every eye, and acknowledged as the "King of kings." Is such an event possible or probable? Who will say it is not possible? Who dare use one argument in favor of the dangerous negative? And that it is probable, we shall proceed to show.

Reader, avail yourself of all that can be said on the subject. Nothing can be gained by disbelieving—much may be lost. Alarming prophecies concentrate on the dissolution of the church, and not on nature. The Clergy almost universally are to oppose these views. Why? God only knows. Some of the above points are almost self-evident, and need but few arguments.

To the glory of God, and the good of man, do I devote the following pages.

THE BIBLE.

No other book comes with such claims of divine origin—with such claims on the obedience of man. None other with such holy admonitions and purity of precept—none other so rich in promise, consolation, and reward to the virtuous; or terrible in threatenings and penalties to the vicious and disobedient. It carries accounts out into another state of existence, summoning delinquents before a tribunal beyond the limits of human vision—a tribunal which can never err—from which there is no appeal.

The Bible is a perfect rule of faith and practice—a way-bill to heaven—a lamp to the path of the just—the luminary of the moral

world—the voice of Heaven to bewildered man, saying, "This is the way; walk you in it"—it is the good man's treasure—the Christian's strength—Faith's refuge—Virtue's consolation—Hope's anchor—and Heaven's pledge of immortality to man.

Did a good man ever stumble with a Bible in his hand, or his footsteps slide while daily consulting the word of his God? Can a man mistake the way to heaven, or fall short of endless life, practising the precepts of the gospel? A man cannot read without gaining knowledge, or practise its precepts without renewing his strength. Who can read, without loving its holy precepts? Who can love, without obeying? Or who obey, without becoming more like the Divine Author? He who converses most with his Bible, converses most with his God; and he who converses most with his God, assimilates most to his image.

Its precepts are mild, pure, and simple—its reward is immortality. Revelation first inspired in man the hope of a resurrection. It alone has shed a divine lustre on the gloomy mansions of the grave. It holds a bright beacon on the other side of the dreadful pass, and bids us hope that death is not to hold an everlasting dominion—that the slumbers of the tomb are not to be eternal.

It is impossible that philosophy could have ever conceived an idea of a resurrection, unaided by revelation. Human wisdom might have shed the tear of despair on the grave of worth and merit; or sighed an eternal adieu to the dearest friends and relations on earth, but for the hope revelation has given.

The Bible is an inexhaustible treasure—it daily pays the daily examiner. We may tire reading any other book; but the relish for the Bible increases with the perusal. I know not how a good man can neglect this wonderful book. How can he know his Master's will without consulting it? Can he depute this important duty to another? It furnishes a perfect system of morals—a perfect plan of duty. No circumstances in which a man can be placed, but it finds him, and is suited to his case. By it the man of God is "thoroughly furnished to every good work"—nothing lacking—nothing superfluous. Where it condemns, who may acquit? Where it acquits, who dare condemn?

The Bible furnishes a history of the past, precepts for the present, and a peep into futurity. In the past we may often read the history of the future. God has commonly kept thrown out a chain of predictions two or three thousand years beforehand relative to the destiny of churches or dispensations, in order to keep men on the look-out; yet, in spite of all these things, the events find the bulk of mankind in an unprepared state.

Men always fancy themselves in the most favored age—that the happy religion, the favored dispensation in which they live, will be handed down from generation to generation, till the very end of time—will be succeeded by eternity itself. This often precludes investigation, and predictions relative to the close of dispensations are applied to times the most remote—to events the most distant.

Prophecy will as certainly point us forward to an event, as the event will point back to the prediction. There can be no more certain application than there is ground for expectation. Prophecy or precept can have no private interpretation. An incomprehensible revelation is a contradiction in terms—is not a revelation at all. Prophecy is as much revelation as precept. Prophecies, not suited to the capacity of the poor—the common people—forfeit a claim on the obedience of nine-tenths of mankind. The poor had the gospel preached to them: so the poor must be interested in the prophecies, or there must be inconsistency in the divine administration. There can be no special application, no threatenings, blessings, or calamity, but will embrace the rich, the poor, the bond and free, who may be found obeying or disobeying the command of God. Prophecy is intended to prepare and to confirm. What preparation can we make when we cannot understand? What confirmation, when there is a doubtful accomplishment? Where the wisdom or the goodness in saying, "Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book," and deliver the sayings and prophecies in an unintelligible language? Why command us to watch as for the approach of a thief, and no object given for which we are to watch?

For what are we to watch? For a reed shaken with the wind—a storm of thunder and hail—an invasion of the Saracens—a Spanish armada—a French revolution!!! To all these things have the prophecies been applied. But the Master says: "Behold I come as a thief; blessed is he that watches." Now here is an object; the coming of the Master, and the relative events.

Prophecy was given out of good will to man. What good will? In giving alarm without providing a refuge—without showing the point of danger, and a place of safety! God, in love, has always given a forewarning of some kind, before the fatal stroke—before the ministers of vengeance execute their dreadful commission on corruption.—A Noah preached before the flood, a Jeremiah prophesied before the evil day, and Christ wept over a devoted Jerusalem, before it was swept with the besom of destruction. And the same God of mercy, justice, and truth, has left on record many predictions of the most alarming kind, which have had no accomplishment, and can have no direct allusion to the general Judgment, or the close of time, but are unavoidably connected with the present Gentile church and its destinies. *God has always saved a remnant—a faithful, obedient few, who tremble at his word.*

No dispensation has ever closed, but with a day of sore calamity; nor have general sore judgments ever fallen, but for corruption. If they be threatened, or poured out, it is for one universal cause—incurable corruption.

Another fact, no less notorious, is this: No dispensation, after becoming corrupt, has ever been restored to primitive purity: and another fact, no less alarming, and which should have a special bearing on the world at the present day, is, that no dispensation, or moral administration, instituted by the Ruler of the universe upon earth, has

ever been continued longer than about two thousand years; nor is there one single text within the lids of the Bible, affording a sufficient warrant that the present dispensation, committed to the Gentiles, is to last longer, or even that long. Nay, we believe the signs of approaching dissolution appear. The harbingers of this tremendous crisis may be seen. The cry is heard, "Behold the bridegroom comes! go you out to meet him."

Our design is to rouse to investigation, to sound alarm. A most eventful day is approaching the world;—the world mostly asleep, priest and people. We purpose showing, from the 'signs of the times,' from prophecy, from reason and analogy, that the present moral administration,--the dispensation committed to the Gentile church,—is drawing to a close—has become corrupt—is never to be renovated;—is to go into dissolution—is to be swept with the "besom of destruction"—is to be rolled together like a useless scroll, with all its appendages, and laid aside, before the introduction of the Millennium, or Christ's universal reign.

The Millennium is to be a new dispensation, as different from the present as the present is from the past. Its harbingers are to be famine, war, pestilence, and fire. We are to be devoted to the literal fulfilment of prophecy, especially in what relates to Christ's second advent into the world. To the Apocalypse!—it is high time the meaning of this mysterious book was examined;—no time to be lost: and I do affirm, regardless of contradiction, that all the alarming predictions in the Bible, standing unfulfilled, concentrate on the dissolution of the church, or the present dispensation:—not on nature, at all.

Having thus far premised, we will first briefly touch upon a few items of

CHURCH CORRUPTION.

All will acknowledge, at once, that the christianity of the world, taken at large, is much adulterated, fallen, shorn of its glory, compared with what it was in its primitive state; that it will not stand the test of the sacred oracles. In the very face of reason, or the Bible—in full view of God's former dealings with old corrupted dispensations, the majority of the world *will believe* that God, in the plenitude of his mercy, will overlook human imperfection, and accommodate himself to the corruption of the present dispensation; or, as a sovereign, in his own *time*, and *way*, will renovate the church, and that she will *then* "come up out of the wilderness, leaning on her beloved," &c. This is hoped, this is believed, rather than believe God's word, or that he will resort to his usual method of renovating corrupted dispensations.

Let me ask those who are talking about regenerating christianity, desiring to restore the ancient order,* Upon what principles is it

*Perhaps the writer means only to say that the ancient order of things cannot be restored, either fully or exclusively, by moral means; and not that it ought not to be attempted by moral means. It cannot be the latter, because the de-

to be done? On moral? or on physical? Perhaps none will say on physical principles. If on moral principles, from whence is it to rise? Is there to be an increase of light and motive given? With the present ratio of light and motive, corruption is gaining strength, and crime is on an alarming increase, in a dreadful proportion to the increase of population. It may be said that the energies of the Spirit are to be enlisted in the mighty work; that there will be great outpourings, &c. Whose fault is it that these outpourings are withheld? Dare we charge the fault on God?

Some may say that truth will prevail. Does not the history of the world contradict this, and common observation teach a different theory? If error were not too strong for truth,—aye, for the Bible,—truth would heal the corruptions of the day. Do the divisions, the diversities of opinion, the conflicting interests, the warring elements of christianity, originate in truth, or in error? None will say in truth. Truth does not heal them;—for this plain reason: it cannot. It is too weak, and needs the physical hand of God, occasionally, to avenge its wrongs. Now, in spite of truth, error and corruption have gained a dreadful ascendency in the church. On what principles can we expect truth to cast out the demon? Does corruption ever purge itself? If truth was too weak to prevent an evil, how can it cure? It is easier to prevent disease, than to heal.

The christian world, at the present day, is dreaming about restorations, Millenniums, &c. without examining on what ground they are to be brought about. Effects always correspond with a relative cause. A cause will always produce an effect exactly in proportion to its strength, in the natural or moral world. Need we argument to prove that there is a morbid action in the system, when the symptoms of death appear in every feature? What a contrast between the present and primitive christianity! How rarely to be found the piety, the spirituality, that existed even twenty years ago! Alas, what will twenty or thirty years more, of such declension, bring about! Just as soon may we expect a stream to rise above its fountain, as expect crime to cease uncaused, error to lay down its hostility to truth, or corruption to purify itself. Nothing but the physical hand of God, the last resort of heaven, will bring the world to see; aye, to feel. Nothing else will check the mighty tide of vice.

---

sign of his essays is to work reformation as far as possible, to make the remnant as large as possible, and to save as many as possible from the impending vengeance. Besides, his analogies and corroborative arguments require—nay, his own signs of the times require, that as it was before the Flood, before the destruction of the Jewish state, reformation should be preached; and what is true reformation but a restoration of the ancient gospel, or of the faith once delivered to the saints, with the order of things connected with it—not merely in the letter, but in the spirit and reality of these things? And, indeed, the demonstration and proof of his propositions will be additional arguments to urge the immediate and indispensable necessity of a return to the primitive faith and practice. With the pertinence and power of Peter's exhortation, from his own premises, he may say, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation; for behold the day comes."—*Ed.*

The world is ripening for the sickle. I would ask, When is the church to rise in her renovated strength, deck herself the Bride, the Lamb's wife; evangelize the world? What is she doing? What has she done?—Made a few hundred converts, in as many hundred years. In the heathen world there are probably more than an hundred thousand souls, twice told, born into the world, for one converted to christianity. This at once presents impossibility, to any thing but blind infatuation; and such there are, who dream that the present antichristian christianity is to evangelize the world, soften the stubborn Jew, win over the followers of Mahomet to a religion, for any thing they can see, no better than their own.

The last and only resort that blind infatuation can have, is this: That God, as a sovereign, having all power in his hands, can, in his own *time* and *way*, bind Satan, put forth his mighty energy, pour out his *Spirit*, revive his *work*, and renovate the church: for who may limit the Almighty? We may limit the Almighty to his word, to his usual manner of dealing with the world, to his former method of healing incurable corruption. Long abused mercy, warnings and threatenings long disregarded, have always been followed by judgments.

The flood, the destruction of Jerusalem, with many other circumstances of notoriety, witness the alarming truth, that God occasionally touches the world with his finger, when men grow corrupt and forget the Almighty rules: he then leaves an evidence of his footsteps, a monument of divine displeasure, a dreadful warning to following ages, of the consequence of corruption. For such an event as this, the world is fast ripening. But more of this hereafter.

To return: Does God act on sovereign principles with free agents? Does he regenerate men by power? or by motive? If he does not regenerate men by *power*, when they grow corrupt, neither may we expect it to be done with corrupted dispensations: it is contrary to moral government. The doctrine of outpourings of the Spirit, &c. is near akin to physical operations. Supernatural operations, illuminations of the Spirit, outpourings withheld or afforded regardless of the constituted laws in the kingdom of grace, involve the Almighty in difficulties with his creatures, with his word, out of which I can see no retreat. If the world is to be evangelized by extraordinary outpourings of the Spirit, whose fault is it that the mighty work is not performed? Not man's; for the operations requisite are withheld: iniquity abounds, the love of many waxes cold, because the *time* for the outpouring of the Spirit is not yet come. Any thing superior to, or different from, the light amd motive presented to the mind of man in the word of God, must be physical, and not moral operations, and not in consonance with man's agency.

I have no wish to enter upon controverted ground; my object is to show the utter impossibility of evangelizing the world, under the present administration; because the world is growing worse: there is a dreadful increase of crime, in spite of human effort; and God (to speak with reverence) will be compelled to increase the present ratio of light and motive, convert the world by power, or resort to the scourge.

I do admit there are partial revivals of vital piety,—short-lived, generally—some occasional vigorous pulsations about the heart, while the extremities are cold and stiff in death. It is like the glow on the cheek of consumption; like a frenzied imagination, fancying itself hale and strong, on the verge of dissolution.

A prevalent missionary mania would convert the heathen,—Hindoos or the antipodes,—while thousands are perishing from lack of knowledge at home! This consumpted christianity, with *the most corrupt means on earth*, is trying to spread the holy religion of Christ, begging its thousands for the purpose of sending the gospel abroad, while at home it is rendered almost abortive by the unhallowed conduct of its professors. Corruption, in either church, or state, abounds in an exact ratio to the amount of filthy lucre within the power of the administration; and yet officers, in church or state, are in pursuit of this corrupting principle, as tireless as time and insatiable as the grave. But I must take the subject more in detail, and examine the various items; and at the head of the catalogue will set

THE DIVISIONS IN CHRISTIANITY.

Is Christ divided? Each division (and they are almost as numerous as the stones) claims the prerogative of being the most holy, the most orthodox, the most legitimate successors of apostolic purity.* This may be controverted; but where is the party that does not fancy itself nearer right than any other—nearer perfection—that has not set up its standard of perfection, crying, "Lo! here is Christ!" "*Come and join us?*" &c. This is the watch-word of all—the universal practice—"*Go with us—we will do you good.*" Who has not often heard such language—such arguments, by the recruiting officers in the church? Enlisting, enrolling, marshalling, and training, according to their various tactics, the different battalions of Christians, all in different uniform—all in array against the different mottos, banners, names, and interests of different Christians.

Now, without a miracle, could a different state of things exist, than that which presents itself on the motley face of christendom? What else could be expected but broils, animosities, persecutions, wars, and blood? Who has not witnessed the broils of parties? Those factions which have rent and torn the body of Christ? Or is it the body of Christ that wars on itself? Can the members of Christ's body war on the members of Christ? Or can *a house divided against itself*

*We quote the following, and that, too, coming from the youngest of all the daughters of Babylon. After stating their success (for they number their converts yearly—their Israel) a caution is introduced:—

"That should your preachers or people, through the channel of our annual reports, or otherwise, grow proud of their success, or of our increasing number, our future exertions will be paralyzed, and we shall be marked with the manifest disapprobation of Heaven; whilst he will turn his hand to other instruments to promote the great interests of his militant kingdom."—*Report of the Synodical Committee of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.*

"Other instruments"!! Is it not plainly implied in the passage that God is not promoting the interests of his "militant kingdom" through their instrumentality only? Is this not the indirect language of all the parties?

stand? Is he a member of Christ's body, who dare persecute, or defame, or indulge a bad spirit toward a brother for *opinions*—for enjoying his inalienable right—that of thinking for himself?

This thing of becoming God's vicegerents—the executor's of his vengeance on heresy—has martyred Christ's best followers, and drenched the world in blood. This thing of going beyond the limits prescribed by the Master—of servants making laws for the Master's house, has shed more blood of saints than all that was shed in ten bloody persecutions under Pagan Rome; and where the earth has "helped the woman"—*to wit*, where civil authority has set a "*hitherto*" to clerical tyranny, "they smite with the tongue." That unruly member is let loose with lawless *slang*· reputations are martyred, characters assailed, and odious epithets applied to spotless reputation—for believing—aye, believing God's word for themselves—a right which God allows to all—which he alone dare challenge. Heaven has given rules by which men may judge, condemn, or acquit men for actions, not *opinions*. The millions of martyrdoms which have been perpetrated since the son of perdition assumed the clerical throne—usurped the temple of God, have all been for "*wrong faith*"—for believing contrary to *creeds*, or laws imposed on the household of the Master by professed servants—servants ruling God's heritage with a rod of iron.

In the great day of accounts, the balance of the sanctuary by which men are to be weighed when entering another state of existence, is to have charity for a counterpoise. "I was hungry, and you fed me; thirsty, and you gave me drink; naked, and you clothed me; sick and in prison, and you visited me." And "inasmuch as you have done it to one of the least of these, you have done it to me." But men, before they can be admitted into the *Sanctum Sanctorum* on earth, are required to believe such and such articles of *faith*—just such as the founders of the faction or heads of department may please to prescribe.

Reader, is this corruption? or what other name in the English language will you find for it? And it is an indubitable evidence of corruption; aye, of rottenness at the *core*. When men cannot meet together as a church, unite in the common worship of God, sing, pray, preach, or commune together, without a perfect unanimity of opinion. It may be said, "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" To this I would reply, that it is impossible for men to disagree, obeying the commands of Christ. They may differ in opinion, but not fall out by the way. Can we claim the blessing of the Master when living in violation of his commands? Who can be a disciple of the meek and lowly Saviour, while refusing the hand of charity—without exercising forbearance, brotherly kindness, long-suffering, &c. Is it the religion of Christ that turns not the other cheek when smitten? If we are to test Christianity by the Bible—condemn where it condemns—acquit where it acquits—alas? how few will stand the scrutiny! how few be saved! how few when the Master returns will hear the plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou

into the joy of thy Lord!" Alas! what a different award is pending! what a sad reckoning is soon to take place among the servants!—*servants* who, for the sake of *convenience*, for the sake of *opinion*, are making and supporting the divisions in the body of Christ—beating the men-servants and maidens.

We are told by the blind guides, the false teachers of the day, that the divisions in Christianity are on the decline—that churches are uniting. Now where is the solitary instance of two denominations becoming one? They may enter into combinations, treaties of peace, cease hostilities for a season: so do the nations till it is their interest to make war. You may tell me France and England are united, because they are not at open war. The parties in religion are about as widely different from each other as the different nations, and speak as different language. You might as well attempt to unite the nations of the world in one common league or language as the different sects.

How will you unite churches where opinions and interest are at opposites? How will the churches ever be united on different *bonds of union?* Here is an impossibility at once presented. Different *bonds of union* produce different interests: conflicting interests will produce hostilities while sun and moon endure. Now there are names, bonds of union, and different interests to be laid aside before *union*. And coupled with these bonds, names, &c. are feelings and attachments which death can scarcely dissolve—sensibilities and interests as dear as immortality—disgusts and antipathies which the "war of elements" will barely obliterate; and thousands among the different parties who would go to the stake for their *name* or *creed*.

Reason opposed to tradition is as light as air. Traditions handed down time out of mind are rarely or never changed. Demonstration, not reason, has produced all the changes in religion for the better on earth. Demonstration first gave Christianity success in its passage; and nothing else will give it success again among the heathen. Nor has Christianity gained a handbreadth of territory since demonstration has left its footsteps; and nothing else but this, or the vials of the wrath of Almighty God, will put a check to sectarian madness—check the present tide of vice.

The divisions in the Christian world have an unfavorable tendency to weaken the testimony of the gospel. Infidelity is made strong by the professed friends of the Christian religion. The animosities existing between professed Christians, the diversities of opinion so zealously maintained, so warmly contested, have made more Deists than all the writings that infidelity ever has, or ever can, throw into world. And the wars and controversies which have rent and torn christendom into so many factions, have originated about *opinions;* many of them far beyond the reach of human knowledge. Opinions believed or disbelieved, make men neither better nor worse.

Christ said, "By this shall all men know you are my disciples, if you have love one for another." Now reverse the rule, and it is no less true: 'By this shall men know that you are *not* my disciples, if you have not love one for another.' Now how much love will we find

among the different sects? Just about as much as existed between a Jew and a Samaritan. Partyism begets intolerance: the religion of Christ, forbearance, brotherly kindness, &c. Christianity, taken by the bulk, presents not to view the great leading feature of Christ's religion. It comes with a sword in one hand, a cross or creed in the other. The spirit of domination, so plainly visible in all the parties, will fairly warrant the expression.

I say not these things for the sake of wounding a single individual, nor to the disparagement of the Christian religion. My hope of salvation is alone predicated on an unshaken faith in Christ and a strict obedience to the precepts of the gospel. It is the abuse of the Christian religion I am pointing at. In speaking of corrupt Christianity, I mean, in general terms, the mass of professors—that part of the human family denominated Christians.

I suppose there is not a party in christendom at this time without an organ—a periodical at its head—strengthening, confirming, and building up its favorite *ism:* and yet we are told they are becoming more united. Why? Because they sometimes are heard to preach a sermon or two without slandering their neighbors. Because occasionally you may hear men soberly preaching Christ and him crucified. Churches, as well as individuals, have their lucid intervals—their days of respite from intoxication; and I am firmly convinced of the fact that this partyism, this spiritual drunkenness, this wine of Babylon, has been the legitimate source of more evil, more distress, persecution, and bloodshed, than all the liquor ever distilled or drunk on earth.*

We may bless our God that we are living in an enlightened land, that civil authority has put a stop to the effusion of human blood on account of religion. By whom do we hold this inestimable blessing? By whom has it been bestowed? By civil or clerical influence?

The earth has helped the *woman;* that is, the civil authority has set bounds to the clerical—a *hitherto.* How few of those stall-fed theologians, those lordly pontiffs in the clerical kingdom, have ever stept forward in defence of the liberty of conscience! Give them the power they will demand, and see if racks, dungeons, and fire will not be the arguments resorted to for the purpose of purging the church of heresy. These arguments have been tried with success by the great Mother of *Harlots*, and some of the daughters too. They all prove their pedigree—go the length of their chain. Human nature is the same in all ages: power begets infallibility, which soon becomes the executor of God's vengeance on *heresy.*

Is there no meaning in Rev. xviii. 3.—"For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication"? Is there not drunkenness

*I am as far from advocating the dangerous and unprofitable use of spirituous liquor as any man in existence; but have little faith in the Temperance Society ever healing the world of this most dreadful evil. I am candidly and honestly in the belief, from my personal observation, from the increase of those filthy shops for vending the deadly poison, that drunkenness and every other vice is on an increase, notwithstanding the various reports to the contrary.

plainly implied in the passage, and to an unlimited extent? "All nations;" this must relate to the churches. Christ's church is called "a holy nation." If the Apocalypse be a history of nations, in the common acceptation, to what nation? of how many? where begin or end? If it be a history of nations, I fearlessly pronounce it a bundle of absurdities, without an object in heaven, earth, or hades.. Churches are meant—wine, raging, implied. Has God cast an unwarranted odium, libelled the churches by the insinuation? Or was it a prophetic portrait of the character the church was to assume, some prominent feature in Christianity after the rise of the son of perdition? Is there any chance to mistake in applying the notorious trait to the partyism, intolerance, and the universal thirst for domination, manifest in every branch of the scattered and divided flock. They are teaching opposites with an unwearied industry and zeal, which nothing but truth should inspire. And it requires far lesss sagacity to see that they are all wrong, than to determine which is right.

The natural effects of common drunkenness are, error in judgment, and courage in maintaining. Is not this justly applicable to the spiritual *drunkards?* And much of what is palmed on the world for contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, is nothing but the ebullitions of spiritual drunkenness. Rant and turmoil, vociferation and conversions of the blood, supersede the humility, the piety, the unaffected devotion, prescribed by the meek and lowly Saviour of sinners.

To an unprejudiced observer, the whole system of the gospel must seem perverted, the whole duty of man mistaken. It is all poured forth in clamorous prayers, or in laced, starched pharisaic oblations *toward heaven*, (cheap sacrifice!) instead of patience, acts of kindness, forbearance, &c.

The life most pleasing to God, is that which is spent in most usefulness to our fellow-creatures. A man cannot love his God, and hate his brother: he cannot expect mercy, who shows none.

There is a striking coincidence between the past and the present dispensations. The past persecuted and slew the prophets; the present is persecuting and slaying the saints, casting out their names as evil: all arising from the one cause,—the spirit of intolerance, or infallibility; an invincible thirst of domination, which would dictate to the consciences of God's people, seize the reins of government, control the destinies of man, in this world and in the world to come, under the specious garb of sanctity,—a pretext of doing God service! Could you have made a Jew believe he was persecuting, condemning, and shedding innocent blood, when crucifying the Lord of glory? O no: he was doing God service. He had the same criterion to judge by, which men have now-a-days—the scrutiny of their own feelings—a consciousness of being right! This thing of testing right and wrong by feeling, by conscience, has been the cause of boundless error, of boundless human misery.

The persecuting Christian, Turk, or Jew, judges by the same rule: all alike pious, confident, and right. Feeling is the most uncertain

rule that right and wrong was ever tried by. It will forever change, or differ, as there is a difference in education. By the only infallible rule of right and wrong on earth, will that man's religion stand condemned, who dares persecute; and I will give the phrase a very wide range, embracing words as well as actions. I am willing to extend charity as far as the Bible suffers me to go, and no further.

Now, reader, will not the Bible condemn nine-tenths of christendom, taken at large? How unlike the primitive religion under the Apostles, and their successors for many ages? Is it the same, or is it a spurious religion, palming itself on the world under the christian garb.

The present christianity of the world gives the wicked no pain—no uneasiness. So much like themselves they have ceased to persecute—forsooth, they have long ago yielded the palm to hands wielding the sword, or "smiting with the tongue" with far greater dexterity. The religion of Christ teaches humility, non-resistance, to turn the other cheek, to think others better than themselves, not to render evil for evil, railing for railing. How unlike what we see! Ridicule substituted for argument—insult unavoidable, if you dare to differ in opinion from your Priest. Pulpit slander, common; sermonizing, a trade; pride and arrogance, prevalent; speculating Priests, gospel merchandizers, the purest religion ever instituted perverted in every way, made by the bulk a system of swindling and speculation.

Now, reader, is it a strange thing that infidelity is on a dreadful increase—gaining strength, while the pure religion of Christ is on the wane—divided and made weak? The emphatical prayer of the Master, "that they may be one, even as we are one" frustrated, a hundred different folds, names, and distinctions, as many jarring interests, as many bonds of union, as many different tongues, crying, "Lo! here is Christ!" each zealously contending for the faith once delivered to the saints—each party living in plain violation of the commands of the Master—all looking for the plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servant!"—all looking for Millenniums; when, at the same time, the sword of Omnipotence is about to be bathed in the gospel heavens—in the polluted dispensation.

Amidst the endless division and intolerance in the Christian, world, there is one thing in which they all agree; and it is no less a proof of corruption than the former. It is the means they resort to for the purpose of spreading the gospel. Their ceaseless levies on their subjects for *filthy lucre*—the most corrupting principle on earth. And I do affirm it, regardless of contradiction, that governments either civil or ecclesiastic, are corrupt in an exact proportion to the amount of filthy lucre required to propel the machinery. You will find churches corrupt in proportion to their wealth; and spiritual, proportioned to poverty. This is most strictly applicable to the Clergy. Did I wish to make them as corrupt as sin, I would give them what money they would demand. Christ forbid the use of

money in his service;* but his professed ambassadors at the present time take all they can get, and receive it as a due! and call it supporting the gospel! This was the first cause of gospel corruption; and the gospel has been polluted in proportion as this forbidden lure has been enlisted into its service. It may be said that Christ ordered a purse—aye, and a sword too—as much warrant for the one as the other. Christ in commissioning his disciples, used every means to make them believe their help and dependence was from above—almost precluded human aid. At the present one might be led to conclude that there was a re-commission given—a new charter granted, authorizing the disciples now-a-days to compass sea and land for *money*—to pray, preach, or beg for money—to receive from the hands of penury and want, the widow and the fatherless, all that their credulity or devotion can possibly be induced to throw into the "*treasury of the Lord!*" Even the midnight earnings of the poor degraded Ethiopian have been thus extorted from him by these merciless beggars.

If blind infatuation can only be wrought up to believe that thousands of souls are depending for their salvation on clerical labors and missionary exertions, and those labors depend on the charity of God's people; that souls must perish unless the gospel be supported—without *money* be contributed to the cause of God! That they owe their souls as well as their good things to him whose cause they plead; that the demand is from Heaven, and in the name of Heaven they apply for a pittance of the bounties that God has bestowed, and now asking a part back; that what is given to God will be restored fourfold, and it will be so much laid up in heaven.

With these and the like arguments the credulous believe and bestow—the pampered beggars receive and grow fat on the merchandize of the gospel. Forsooth, I cannot tell which is the best trade: to pray souls out of purgatory for *money*, or beg it to prevent them going thither. The one is a *profitable trade* of the *Mother*; the other a plausible pretext of the daughters, for the one special purpose—*money!*

I do not say that the missionary business began in palpable corruption. There may have been some infatuated devotees who were

*We are ignorant of any such general prohibition; but we presume our author here alludes to the charge given to the Twelve on the first mission to announce the approaching Reign. But in this he became responsible for their support himself: and when they returned, and he asked them if they lacked any thing, they were able to reply in the negative. Our Lord, *who was himself the gospel*, was supported by the disciples; and *the women who assisted him with their substance*, are celebrated even to this day. But we know our author's meaning is that our Lord himself discountenanced all such schemes for raising money by licensed beggars, who are themselves paid four or five hundred dollars a-year for begging from all to raise missionary funds. While, however, he denounces these as the very antipodes of the Christian character, we fear the too great latitude he gives these remarks, would lead some to think that he considered any contribution of time, or labor, or property, (of which money is but the representative,) for those who anciently proclaimed the gospel, was unauthorized by our Lord.—*Ed.*

honest and zealous at the outstart—misguided in their zeal, who would have performed one of the greatest miracles on earth had they succeeded, or could they succeed, in converting the heathen to Christianity without the aid of miracles. But Speculation, with its foul paw, soon contaminated the stream; and will so do forever, when a sufficient bounty is offered in *gold*. A lure for hypocrites—and just such converts will they make as they are themselves. Will you offer *honesty* pecuniary reward for serving the Lord? Could human ingenuity devise a surer way to fill the pulpit with hypocrites and the church with corruption?

Pay a man well for serving his God, and you will soon make him a servant of the devil. Nor do I believe the New Testament will warrant the opinion that there was ever one cent raised by contributions to support the gospel:* they were uniformly for the relief of the poor. And farther, you may go into the world and catechise the nations on the subject of governing by *money*, and you will find the government most corrupt requiring most money. The fall of nations or kingdoms may be traced back to this universal cause; and it will produce its legitimate effect in church or state. The law of gravity is not more certain than the laws of ethics.

What else has shorn Christianity of its glory, stript it of its diadem, drove demonstration from its footstops? The Sampson that has plucked the pillars from underneath thrones and empires—this sly insidious foe that poisoned with its unhallowed touch the pure and holy religion of Christ, is to evangelize the world! The principle which adulterated is by the magic power of *plenty* to transform itself into an angel of light, and carry the glad tidings of salvation round the globe!

The most successful missionaries we have any account of went to work without purse or scrip, penny less to their graves, crowned with success and immortality. Now-a-days it requires an outfit of some thousands, and then a success such as would have made fishermen again of the old missionaries. No doubt but the church of Rome has in her possession more wealth than all the world beside, and more corruption too. Money with them is just the one thing needful. It expiates for all crimes past, present, and to come. Its potency is not limited to this earth: hell owns its power. For money enough his Holiness would depopulate the region of darkness, and leave purgatory a solita

*Here again our author appears to us not sufficiently guarded. While there were no such contributions as those of which he speaks, the New Testament preachers on their missions were sustained by the contributions of the brethren. That the Apostles were invested with a *right* to demand the contributions of *the disciples*, in their labors, is as clearly propounded by Paul, 1 Cor. ix. as is the doctrine of the resurrection in the 15th chapter of the same letter. And that those who labored in the word or gospel, and in teaching the churches, were to be sustained by the churches, is frequently and clearly taught by the Apostles. See 1 Tim. v. 17, 18. Phil. iv. 14, 15, 18. 2 Thess. iii. 9. Gal. vi. 6. 1 Peter v. 2, &c. But that system was wholly different from the present. The idea of "educating a person for the ministry," and paying him when trained for so many sermons, or for laboring on the day of rest, and minding his own business during five or six days in the week, is the offspring of paganized Christianity, and worthy of all the censures which our author can bestow on it.—*Ed.*

ry waste, without a single tenant—turn every soul out, from Adam down to the present day.

This is what money will do between blind credulity and clerical abuses; and this is called Christianity, composing a large majority of Christendom; and by those hands, through the foulest channel on earth, has the authority been transmitted to our clerical *gentry*. I would ask the silly dreamers of the age, (those who would renovate Christianity, evangelize the world by the present system of things,) on what principle is the Catholic church to be restored? Where, or how is the work to begin? Will they hear the voice of reason? Do they regard the voice of God in his word? Are they obeying one single precept of the gospel? and yet they are to be restored—to become the fold of Christ—to be the bride—the Lamb's wife!

Alas! what a fatal disappointment is awaiting the world! What different scenes are soon to be transacted! how different from those in anticipation! how soon will we be roused from our dreams, from our slumbers, by the midnight cry, "Behold the bridegroom cometh!" The syren song of peace and safety will soon be exchanged for the mighty crush of thrones, the rolling of the heavens together as a scroll, and the vials of the wrath of Almighty God, without mixture, poured out on corrupted Christianity. Reader, these things are coming apace, at the very door, just as sure as there is truth in the Bible, and will as certainly be scoffed at by the peace-prophesying priests.

New Year's Evening at Mr. Goodal's.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 46.]

CONVERSATION AT DINNER.

WHEN the company, according to seniority, had walked out of the parlor into the dining room, and while all were standing round a table, not sumptuously decorated, but richly laden with all that nature, reason, and religion required—Mr. Goodal, with the dignity of a Patriarch and the simplicity of a Christian, gave thanks to God for the blessings before them, and for the happiness he enjoyed in having around his table on that happy day so many dear to him in the flesh and in the Lord. Maria Goodal, one grand-daughter, and two grand-sons were amongst those who waited on the table. After all were seated and had begun to partake of the bounties before them, Mr. Reed said he would propound a question to the youngest person at table, which he did not know that he could quite satisfactorily answer himself. "Whence," said he, "originated the custom of eating with the head uncovered?"

Robert Fowler.—As I am the youngest person at table, I must regard the question as addressed to me. But as it is the first time I have heard it, or thought of the subject, I can, off-hand, only say, that I think *convenience* dictated that custom, as it would be rather inconvenient for gentlemen to eat with their hats on; though I know they sometimes do it.

Mr. Reed.—It is a good reason, Robert, and such a one as I was thinking you would assign.

Robert Fowler—I should like to have a better one from you, Mr. Reed.

Mr. Reed.—It has occurred to me that I heard some one say, that the custom originated from the pious Patriarchs, who, from gratitude to God, uncovered

their heads while they partook of his bounties, and from them it spread through society and descended to us.

Mr. Goodal.—The question is new to me also; but I have often felt myself inclined to uncover my head from a sense of God's goodness in furnishing me with an apple, a grape, or a drink of water when I needed it. And I may add, that it often impressed me as disrespectful of God to eat with the head covered. But, brother Reed, did not the Christian nations derive many of their domestic customs from the Jews?

Mr. Reed.—The Jews being the first Christians, and the Gentiles being ingrafted upon their stock and embodied with them, many Jewish customs in some modified shape pervaded the Christian communities. Eating and drinking was an essential part of the religion of the Jews. They had so many festivals, and were to appear so often before the Lord in the course of one year, that it is natural to suppose they would acquire such feelings of devotion in the act of eating, as to make it quite natural for the religious part of them to think of God while eating on ordinary occasions for the refreshment of nature.

Mrs. Reed.—But do you not thus deprive us females of an opportunity of some token of our gratitude to our heavenly Father, while you oblige us to appear with our heads covered in all public assemblies and at table?

Mr. Reed.—I am sure, my dear, I never laid an injunction on you touching your head. I always thought you were the best judge of what was suitable.

Mrs. Reed.—True, my lord. But as I have always regarded you as my constitutional and moral head since the day I vowed allegiance to you, from that day till now I have worn a covering on my head, *because of the angels*, who, though of celestial birth and dignity, veil their faces with their wings in the presence of their Lord: for thus you have expounded to me the 9th and 10th verses of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians:—"The woman was created for the man;—for this reason the woman ought to have a veil upon her head," [emblem of submission,] "because of the angels."

Mr. Goodal.—Very good, sister Reed, you covered your head the day you put yourself under the guidance of your husband; and as you have not since renounced brother Reed, you always wear a covering on your head, in token that you regard him as your head, and honor him as such. The glory of a married woman is, therefore, her husband. Well, my daughter, you must not complain of a custom which is founded on so much good reason, if not upon the most unequivocal authority.

Mrs. Reed.—I complain not of the custom, father Goodal, but of the reason assigned for a man's eating with an uncovered head; because I desire not only to be as grateful to my heavenly Father, but to have the same opportunity of signifying it by corresponding signs while partaking of the bounties of the table.

Mr. Goodal.—Very good, my daughter; but I will tell you how you are no loser in this case. When you see brother Reed eating with an uncovered head, regarding him as your constituted head, you can feel all gratitude to your heavenly Father, not only for these table comforts, but for a husband who uncovers his head before the Lord in your presence. And the same piety is evinced by you in gratefully remembering that the Lord has permitted you to sit by the side of a brother husband with your head covered, whose vassal you might have been, had not the Saviour of the world elevated you to this rank.

Mrs. Reed.—I thank you, father Goodal. You have turned the misfortunes of my sisters into blessings, and have reminded me how much I owe to the Lord for the head he has given me, who is my *brother*, as well as my master.

Mrs. Goodal.—Sister Reed, when I look at father Goodal's grey heirs, which scarcely conceal the top of his head, and see him approach the table, bowing his uncovered head before the Lord, I rejoice in it; for to me it is a sign of what the Elders do in heaven, feasting on the love of God, when they cast their crowns at the feet of our glorified Saviour. The covering which I wear upon my head in the presence of my husband, I regard rather as a sign of my subordination, than as a protection from the cold, or as an ornament to my person.

Mr. Reed.—Its plainness, mother Goodal, indicates that. There is nothing which to me appears more indicative of the want of good sense, as well as of true piety, than the costly and fantastic head-dresses of women professing godliness. The unmarried Christian ladies disparage themselves; and the married disparage both themselves and their husbands by such conformities to a vain and dissipated world.

Mr. Williamson.—Surely, Mr. Reed, what is merely decent is not incompatible with Christianity.

Mr. Reed.—I would thank you, Mr. Williamson, or any one at table, to give me an authentic definition of the word *decent*. Like the chameleon, it is of every color, fashion, and kind, and varies in every parallel of latitude and longitude, from Nova Zembla to the Cape of Good Hope.

Mr. Goodal.—As you are all silent, I will tell you what I have long regarded as a very *indecent* thing. To see a person or a family sit down to table to partake of God's goodness; and after they have sat down to invoke God for a blessing on the food.

Mr. Williamson.—Not indecent, Mr. Goodal, to ask a blessing!

Mr. Goodal.—No; not to ask a blessing; but to acknowledge one in such an attitude of body. Do we not rise up on our feet to address an equal? And do we not bow to a superior? Yet in approaching the Lord of hosts we sit down and then address him! Surely this is not "to glorify the Lord with our bodies." This is not in accordance with the command, "Whether, you eat or drink, do all to the glory of God." But we come to table to *receive*, not to *ask* a blessing. What do you mean, Mr. Williamson, by "asking a blessing?"

Mr. Williamson.—That God would bless the food to our use, or make it conducive to our health.

Mr. Goodal.—Do you mean that God would change its nature, assist our digestive organs, or suspend any of the laws of nature for our benefit?

Mr. Williamson.—I think without the blessing of God it cannot do us any good.

Mr. Goodal.—But God has blessed it already! for "every creature of God is good if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

Mr. Williamson.—Then you only *give thanks* when you come to eat.

Mr. Goodal.—As our Master and his Apostles gave thanks before eating, so I think ought we.

Mr. Williamson.—Among my former religious acquaintance in New York it was customary to ask a blessing upon the food before we eat it, and after eating it to return thanks to God.

Mr. Goodal.—And that is the best reason in the world with many for adopting and continuing the practice. But I have made it a rule with myself, first to inquire who originally introduced, or established, a custom, before I can in my worship acquiesce in it.

Mr. Williamson.—Into that matter I have not inquired; but as to the most decent manner of addressing God, I must confess that it appears to me most comely to address God with at least as much external respect as we show to man.

Mr. Goodal.—Methinks, if the Lord himself fell upon the ground, or on his knees, or stood up and lifted his eyes to heaven when he spoke to God his Father, we, sinful dust and ashes, ought not to sit down before we speak to God. Besides, we are so constituted that our own attitudes of body exert a very considerable influence upon us. How it is with others, I presume not to say; but as for myself, I must say, that I cannot feel the spirit of prayer, without the attitude of prayer.

Mr. Williamson.—I again confess that it does appear doubly inconsistent at one time to kneel down, and at another to sit down to address God, when circumstances do not compel it. As we have first to approach the table on our feet, it certainly is most comely to return thanks to God for his bounties, than first to sit down and then address him.

Mr. Reed.—But, Mr. Williamson, I have another remark to make upon the customs of "grace before and after meat." They generally are a sort of morning and evening family prayer; in which there is petition, confession, and a narrative of circumstances, wholly irrelevant, and which, perhaps, have been repeated over eight times in the day.

My neighbor Jarret prays in his family every morning and evening, and says a blessing and a thanksgiving at every meal; and you will hear him substantially repeat all the same ideas each time. Thus his asking a blessing for his breakfast is only a short summary of his morning prayer, and all the others are repetitions of it. So that eight times in the day he asks the same favors and acknowledges the same blessings.

Mr. Goodal.—Mr. Jarret is not the only person in Newtonfields who pursues this course. Almost all our devout neighbors, or the praying part of the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Episcopalians, like sheep, follow one another in this track. But I fear the company will think that we have forgotten the word *decent*, and while talking of some things indecent in religious manners and customs, we shall wander from the question brother Reed proposed.

Mrs. Foster.—I was just going to ask, how will this explain the word *decent* as respects the head-dress of females? I am solicitous on this subject, for my daughters are often asking me questions about what is decent.

Mr. Williamson.—Since the question was proposed I have been revolving it in my mind, and am led to think it means conforming to the customs of our neighbors.

Thomas Goodal.—To me it seems to mean being like the better sort of our neighbors.

William Goodal.—I differ a little from my brother Thomas, and would define the word as indicating a little superiority over the mediocrity of our neighbors.

Mr. Reed.—So it appears we shall have a variety of definitions in your own family, father Goodal.

Mr. Goodal.—As you are all trying your skill in definitions, I will propose the question to mother Goodal, who has been a good deal in the world in her younger years, and much among Christians in her elder years.

Mrs. Goodal.—I am not well skilled in defining words. I have been more attentive to things than to words; but if I were to give my thoughts upon the thing called *decency*, as it appears to me, I would say that it is that behavior or that apparel which is suitable to the character of a professor of the faith. In this I include regard to age, sex, and condition, and some little to circumstances. Cleanliness, plainness, neatness, and simplicity, are, with me, the four elements of decency in apparel and household furniture. And of decent behavior the elements are honesty, veracity, humanity, modesty, and affability. But, brother Reed, I would thank you for your best definition of the term.

Mr. Reed.—I could not improve on the definition you have given of *decency*, as respects apparel, furniture, and behavior. You have left nothing for me to add. But I should be pleased to learn whether sister Fowler is yet satisfied with what she has heard.

Mrs. Fowler.—I can never dissent from my mother, either in theory or practice; but for the sake of my daughters I wished them to hear the opinion of those whose judgment is mature and guided by the wisdom which comes from above.

Mr. Goodal.—My father used to say that the elements of true politeness were all found in the doctrine of self-denial as taught by Jesus Christ. That in paying the most self-denied attention to others, we were most polite; and I have thought that his philosophy of *politeness*, and mother Goodal's philosophy of *decency* were near akin; and for my part, I would not declare non-fellowship with any one who practised upon the principles of their theory.

Mr. Reed.—Then, father Goodal, your daughter Maria, and your grand children, who are so attentively waiting upon us, are the most polite persons in the room; for certainly they are practising the greatest degree of self-denial in fasting and serving, while we are eating and drinking the good things of our heavenly benefactor.

Mr. Goodal.—This is both their duty and their pleasure; and it is my wish to see my children and grand children promoting their own happiness by ministering to that of others. They are best qualified to preside over others who have first learned to serve in the ranks: for he who has not learned to be obedient is not competent to command.

Mr. Williamson.—I am requested by a lady who sits not far from me, to ask Mr. Reed whether he can give any other exposition of 1 Cor. xi. 9, 10, than that advanced by Mrs. Reed. The ladies at this end of the table are very curious to understand that allusion to the angels.

Mr. Reed.—The ladies would smile if I should give them the comment upon this passage, which the great Dr. Lightfoot, President of the Westminster Assembly, which furnished the Puritans with a Confession of Faith, gives of it in the 2d vol. p. 720, of his works. He says, "The angels were the messengers or paranymphs who came to meeting on the part of others to look out for proper spouses for their friends." Bishop Pearce contends that the angels are the heavenly messengers who are always present in the church, as the cherubim were in the temple; and that as Paul exhorted Timothy in the presence of the angels, so he here exhorts women to shamefacedness and modesty in the presence of the angels. But Sir Norton Knatchbull, whom I lately examined on the passage, says that the angels are those messengers which gave to Eve the injunction of homage to her husband; for he says, this law of subordination was given by angels as was the law on Sinai, and he would translate the whole passage thus:—"For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man; neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." Therefore ought the woman to acknowledge the power (*exousian*, translated *veil*) to be on her head; i. e. her husband, because of the angels who said in the name of God, "He shall rule over thee." But Mr. Locke candidly acknowledges he could not understand this passage, and therefore gave no comment upon it. The view which sister Reed has given is at least as plausible as any other: and it has this advantage, that it offers no violence to the spirit and scope of the passage, nor to the construction of the original sentence.

Mrs. Fowler.—This makes the glory of woman to be analogous to the glory of man. His glory is, that he was made in the image of God, and that of the woman is, that she was made in the image of man. If, then, the angels veil their faces in the presence of the Lord, women in the public assembly ought to veil their faces in the presence of men.

Mrs. Reed.—Sister Fowler, it behoves us, then, to esteem our husbands as our head, and to follow our own mind and will only when we do not know theirs.

Father Goodal.—If we have not known our relative duties so well before, as we have learned them to-day, we will be the more happy during the present year, in being able to live more conformably to them than heretofore; for as we grow in knowledge and in conformity to the will of our heavenly father, we increase in holiness and happiness.

Brother Reed, let us retire into the other room.

EDITOR.

A Good Omen.

THE POPE AFFRIGHTED.

GREGORY XVI. the present Pope, in his last encyclal letter, issued from Rome in September last, thus exhibits his alarm:—

"The chair of the blessed Peter, in which we sit, and where Jesus Christ has laid the foundation of his church, is violently shaken, and the bonds of unity are weakened and broken every day. The divine authority of the church is attacked, its rights are destroyed, it is subjected to earthly considerations, and reduced to a base servitude, it is given up by gross injustice to the hatred of

the populace. The obedience due to Bishops is set aside, and their rights are trampled under foot. Our academies and gymnasia resound horribly with new and monstrous opinions, which not only sap the Catholic faith secretly and by subterfuges, but openly make public and criminal war upon it; for when youth are corrupted by the maxims and examples of their masters, the injury to religion becomes much greater, and the perversion of morals more entire. Thus when the restraints of religion, by which alone kingdoms can subsist and authority be maintained, are shaken off, we see the progress of the ruin of public order, the downfall of princes, the overturning of all legitimate power. This mass of calamities results chiefly from the combination of those societies into which all that there is in the most criminal sects and heresies, of sacrilege, disgrace, and blasphemy, flows as into a sewer, with the mingling of all filth. These evils, venerable brethren, and many others, perhaps still more disgraceful, but which are too numerous to be repeated here, and which you very well know cause us to feel deep and bitter grief—us, whom the zeal of the whole house of God ought particularly to consume, placed as we are, in the chair of the Prince of the Apostles."

"The Pope calls on the Bishops to assist him in keeping "the wild boar of the wood from wasting the vine, and the wolves from destroying the flock;" and declares that their duty in that respect will be performed, if, in taking heed to themselves and to their doctrines, they continually bear in mind that "the universal church is shaken by every novelty that prevails," and that according to St. Agathon, "nothing that has been decreed [by the church] should be retrenched, or changed, or added to; but that it is necessary to preserve the decrees pure, and according to their meaning and language." To secure this, they are recommended to inculcate, with great zeal, "confidence and sincere veneration" for the chair of St. Peter, remembering the words of St. Cyprian, that "he falsely flatters himself that he is in the church (of Christ) who abandons the chair of Peter on which the church is founded." They are warned against countenancing the interference of any subordinate officers or members of the church in the prerogatives of the chair, and are directed to teach the duty of implicit submission to all the ordinances promulged by the Pope."

The alarms of "his Holiness" are very analogous to those of some of his children in this country, who are crying out, Novelties! New doctrines! Dangers to the church! Pernicious heresies, &c. The reader can improve upon the hint.

EDITOR.

Sir John Mason's Views of the World.

IN his last moments Sir John Mason thus addressed the family:—"Lo! I have lived to see five Princes, and have been Privy Councillor to four of them. I have seen the most remarkable things in foreign parts; and I have been present in most state transactions for thirty years at home. After so much experience, I have learned that seriousness is the greatest wisdom; temperance the best physician; and a good constitution the best estate; and were I to live again, I would change the court for a cloister; my Privy Councillor's bustle for the retirement of a hermit; and my whole life in the Palace for an hour's enjoyment of God in my closet. All things now forsake me, except my God, my duty, and my prayers."

Everlasting Gospel.—*No. 1.*

THIS Gospel, which has been our motto for three years past, has never yet been preached. It was the symbol of every number, though not a word has yet been said about it. As *the gospel of our salvation* was only found in type and prophecy, in the Jewish scriptures, so the *everlasting gospel* is found, in the Christian scriptures, only on the page of prophecy. We have been, for years, developing the *ancient gospel:* a gospel proclaimed by the twelve angels of the Messiah; first in Jerusalem, then in Samaria, and then to the uttermost parts of the earth. But now we are about to speak of a *future* gospel, a gospel soon to be preached; a gospel which is to be borne on the wings of an angel in the midst of heaven, whose voice is to be heard from pole to pole, and from the rising of the sun to the place of its going down. John, in vision, first saw the angel of this gospel spread his wings, and, with a speed which left behind "the swift-winged arrows of light," fly across the heavens; and as he flew, he heard a voice,—a voice of majestic and momentous import—the meaning of which no mortal yet has fully comprehended.

"Then I saw another angel flying in the midst of heaven, having *an everlasting gospel* to preach to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." So I read it in the English Bible of 1607. The version made by James, a few years afterwards, reads, "*the* everlasting gospel," as if it were a gospel already defined, or that first announced by the twelve angels of the Christian institution. This is a mistranslation; and perhaps, owing to it, the great mass of readers suppose that the word *everlasting* is but an epithet of the gospel of remission, first preached, not in the midst of heaven, but in Jerusalem. But this epithet belongs not to the gospel of remission, and therefore no inspired man ever called the gospel of remission *everlasting*. Corrupted it soon was, and its triumphs have always been limited, and short-lived. As well might the law of Moses have been called universal, or everlasting; as well might any commandment, because recorded on the inspired page, be styled everlasting, as the gospel which was first promulged after Jesus was glorified. But we must not yet anticipate ourselves.

Let it, for the present, be noticed, that the message of the angel was never before announced; that till John saw him in vision, or till the time arrived when he made his appearance in the prospective drama of the mysterious future, the items of this gospel had not been divulged. Now, that it has not yet been preached, is as plain to us as that it was not in the days of the vision and prophecy.

Before presuming to consider the items of the everlasting gospel, we must attend to some preliminary matters; and of these, two shall suffice for the present:—

I. *The Jewish and Christian scriptures commence with history, and end with prophecy.* Three lessons are implied in this fact.

1. That historic and prophetic facts are both necessary to operate on the heart to produce those great moral results necessary to its becoming a temple of the Holy Spirit.

2. That as both history and prophecy are revelations, they are, and must be, morally intelligible, or the moral influence of them is lost to the world.

3. That as the Jewish Scriptures, ending with prophecy, imported another dispensation; so the Christian Scriptures, ending with prophecy, intimate a new state of things on earth.

II. *The first prophecy and the last delivered to apostate man, indicate that affliction and sore trials shall always precede triumph, exaltation, and glory.*

"IT SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD."—The bruising of the serpent's head was the first gospel ever preached, and the first prophecy recorded. And when his head shall have been bruised on earth, then will be an everlasting joy, because an everlasting gospel shall have been announced to the world.

As illustrative of the universal fact that grief and sorrow have always been the prelude of joy, be it observed that in the figurative nation this lesson was taught with a clearness and fulness that make incredulity without excuse.

God promised Abraham that his posterity should be numerous, powerful, triumphant, in the goodliest land on the face of the earth; but that first they should suffer evil treatment, cruel and hard oppression for hundreds of years. So reads the preface, divine and inspired, to the only infallible history of the church.

Joseph was falsely accused, sold for a slave, and after he had suffered the greatest indignities was elevated from the dungeon to the throne of Egypt.

Moses was drawn out of the water before he was rocked in the cradle of state, and became an exile and a shepherd before he was King in Jerusalem.

David was snatched from the jaws of a lion, from the paw of a bear, while following the ewes with lamb; and after being persecuted like a partridge on the mountains by Saul, was placed on the throne of the Twelve Tribes, and made the boldest type in 4000 years of his Son and Lord Messiah.

In the days of Solomon, son of David, Israel was triumphant; but David had a bloody work of it before the Queen of Sheba came from the uttermost parts of the earth to see the glory of Israel triumphant, and to hear the wisdom of its King.

Jesus was born in a stable and hanged upon a tree before he was glorified; and as it was with the typical Mediator and King, and the typical church, so it was with the true Mediator and King; and so will it be with the real church of God.

The Christian religion and the true church have been always oppressed. From the days of Herod the King, till the present, their lives have been sought—their property, reputation, and life have been accounted like sheep for the slaughter. There never has been a genuine follower of Jesus Christ, that was not an afflicted and oppressed man, either in person, property, or character; and while the dragon's head has life in it, it will not. it cannot otherwise be. Like

the Jewish church symbolic, the Christian was to be evilly treated for hundreds of years; for until now we have never had *one Christian King*, except the name has been given in derision by Satan to his Catholic Majesty of France. Christianity and Christians have all been baptized in a cloud and in a sea of troubles from the first day of their march till now; and all that is wanting for Christians to be more hated, and to be more slandered and persecuted, is more similarity to Jesus in character, and a little more power on the part of those who surround the throne of political power. No kingdom in this world has yet become the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

EDITOR.

To Charles Cassedy, Esq.

NO. I.

Respected Sir,

MY desire to present entire, in one number, your very respectful and dignified communication of the 29th October, precluded my offering any remarks upon it. I could not, with due regard to the subjects on hand and the character of this periodical, engross more of its pages on one occasion, on a subject not so immediately in the direct range of the present topics of discussion; otherwise, I should have accompanied your letter with a partial reply. Even now I must divide my reply into a series of numbers, that I may afford room for other subjects of high consideration.

Your request to the contrary alone prevents me from referring you to my Debate with Mr. Owen, for a rational consideration of some of the more prominent difficulties suggested in your letter. In that volume, it appears to me, your objections are fully considered with the exception of, perhaps, one; and that is partially noticed.

Sorry to see one so gifted as yourself—one whose heart is so susceptible of the refined and exalted sentiments of Christianity—and whose tongue is so well furnished to plead the cause of Almighty Love—languishing without the precincts of Messiah's reign, an alien from Israel's commonwealth, and without the *hope*, the well-grounded hope which Christianity inspires, I feel myself impelled to offer you some reflections on the difficulties which prevent your entrance into the kingdom.

From a careful analysis of your letter, now lying before me, the following appear to be the stumbling blocks in your way:—

1. The variety of religious creeds, and the discordant and often contradictory materials of which they are composed.

2. The too narrow and exclusive foundation of the Christian scheme itself, compared with the divine philanthropy developed in all the creation and providence of the Almighty Creator and Benefactor of our race.

3. The Mosaic account of creation assigns not to man an object suited to his constitution, alike worthy of him and his Maker; nor does it suitably explain many phenomena in the animal and vegetable creation.

These, sir, if I mistake not, are the foci of your difficulties and embarrassments;—these the generic heads of the chapters of objections which have hitherto prevented your cordial acquiescence in the mission and redemption of Jesus of Nazareth. In attending to these, I think it possible to meet all that you have alleged in the very ample, perspicuous, and elegant exhibition which you have given of them in the document before me.

On your first objection allow me to tender you the following answer:—

1. The gospel and its counterfeits must always be regarded as *two* things, wholly and essentially different; else we shall imagine that any objection which lies against the abuses of Christianity, or the spurious and counterfeit gospels, lies against the gospel itself. This admission, I presume, I am not more prompt to require, than you to concede.

2. The false gospels, corruptions, and apostacy, of which you justly complain, so far from being an argument, or relevant objection, against its divine original, is a confirmation of it; inasmuch as these defections are distinctly described and fully delineated by the Apostles themselves. Some of them, moreover, required that Christianity, in some shape, should become the religion of the Roman Empire before they could exist. Now, that a religion, which, at first, and during the whole lives of the original witnesses, was universally hated and persecuted, should, in so short a time, be elevated to the imperial throne, was so contrary to all antecedent events--so contrary to universal experience—that it could be known only to men guided by a Spirit to whom nothing is hid. That the Apostles were able in 20 years from the crucifixion of the Messiah, to describe a man of sin, whose very existence required the establishment of a corruption of Christianity on the imperial throne, is just as miraculous as that a Virgin should be the mother of the Saviour of the world, or that Jesus should have been raised from the dead.

3. That Christianity should be liable to such abuses, can afford no objection to its high pretensions: because there is no gift of the Creator which is not liable to similar abuses; and if any thing was bestowed on man which he could not abuse, it would be of no moral use to him—*for he cannot use that which he cannot abuse.* Where there can be no vice, there can be no virtue.

4. Neither can the differences which exist about the meaning or design of any part of the divine communication, furnish a just objection to it; because there is no science, no useful art, concerning which there have not been, and may not again be, differences of opinion. Men have not as yet agreed about the best theory of a plough, nor any of the more common implements of husbandry. Nor are the learned professions more united in the theory and practice of law and physic

than are the various sectarian Doctors of corrupted Christianity. But who infers from hence, that there is no truth in any science, art, or profession—no truth in law, physic, or theology, shocks all common sense.

5. Although, as you say, "*reason* and the *great interests* of mankind seem to require but *one* religion, capable of embracing the whole human race," it is nevertheless true that no communication can be offered to our race which will secure unity of sentiment, feeling, faith, or opinion in those which are addressed. The sun, moon, and stars, those celestial preachers—and the ten thousand voices of the four seasons of the year, with every diurnal revolution of the earth, are unable to teach one and the same lesson to the Persian and the Scythian, to the Syrian and the Egyptian. With that volume which is supposed capable of teaching "natural religion," before the eyes of all nations, whence has it happened that the sun, moon, stars—light, fire, air, winds, water, oceans, seas, rivers, and mountains—men, renowned for both virtue and vice—departed heroes—beasts, birds, fishes, insects, reptiles—trees, shrubs, and plants—minerals and metals—jewels, and the stones of the street—have been deified and adored by nations, families, individuals, from North to South, from East to West, where the volume of nature has been the only guide! Christianity, notwithstanding its numerous abuses, has done infinitely more than all the religions of all ages to give unity of sentiment, faith, and morals to the millions which profess it, than could ever have been found in all the generations of men previous to its introduction.

6. That the Christian religion should, in almost 2000 years, have degenerated in such a world, (a world in heart and life opposed to the purity of its precepts, and to the justice, mercy, and benevolence which it inculcates,) is not more strange than that the human race, originally from one stock, should now be multiplied into different races. Taking features and complexion into the account, may we not say that the fair European—the deep yellow Mongolian, or Asiatic—the copper-colored Indian, or American—the deep brown Malay, found in Malacca and the islands of the Pacific—and the jet black African, constitute five distinct races of men. If nature itself has been unable to resist the invasions of soil, climate, and various circumstances, why should it appear so marvellous, that, after traversing three quarters of the world, Christianity should have changed *its* visage, and have lost some of its original features? It would be as fairly in the power of logic to prove that God did not create man, because of these varieties and circumstantial differences in the race, as that he is not the author of the gospel, because of all these sectarian discrepancies of which you complain.

7. But the preceding remarks are submitted upon other grounds than the real merits of the case; for the truth is, the gospel of Jesus Christ is no more chargeable with these sects, than is General Washington with the late "Ordinance" of South Carolina, or with the wars of Bonaparte. They all stand condemned before the tribunal of Jesus and the Holy Twelve.

Your remarks, then, my dear sir, on the pretensions of these sects, and on their arrogant, illiberal, and denouncing proceedings, justly lie at their respective doors; and it is neither in my power, nor in theirs, to remove them. Not one of them can plead *Not Guilty* of the allegata, and sustain their plea in the presence of the Bible and right reason. But I beg you to consider—how unreasonable, how contrary to your whole course of action in the great affairs of this life, how illogical it would be for you to object against the gospel of Jesus, because of the follies and phrensy of sectarians in this cloudy and dark day—because of their contradictory theories, annunciations, and denunciations; when you cannot put your hand to the plough, to the shuttle, to the helm—when you cannot decide a single question of law or evidence—of physics or metaphysics—or apply for any relief to any art, science, or profession, unless you break through all the entanglements which you have ingeniously woven around yourself in reference to the gospel of God. You must make nothing of this chapter of objections in reference to every other subject; or you must fold your arms in the most perfect supineness; neither presuming to eat, drink, sleep, or labor in any profession, because there may be many a curious question stated, many a new theory broached, which it is not yet in the power of all science and ingenuity satisfactorily to confront, nullify, or oppose. I am, after many years pondering on the infinite subjects of creation, providence, and redemption, more and more deeply impressed with the conviction that we have fewer rational difficulties to encounter, less puzzling theories to explode, less formidable objections to surmount in bowing to the divine mission and authority of Messiah the Lord of life, than in deciding upon the best form of civil government, the best code of laws, the best theory of disease and cure, or the nature of the physical constitution of man. But in our next we shall go more fully into the merits of your difficulties. Meanwhile, accept the assurance of my high consideration and respect. EDITOR.

Messrs. Cleland & Jennings.

THE unclean spirit of the apocalyptic frogs appears to have possessed my friend Cleland and the nephew of the late Mr. Jennings. Their croaking is heard in all corners of the land. A half sheet, addressed to *A. Campbell*, has been specially directed (I have the news from all quarters) to the readers of the Harbinger——*to all but to the aforesaid A. Campbell!** Our correspondents have written to us

*Mr. S. C. Jennings is pouring a *double portion* of his extra half sheets into the post-offices in Old Virginia. I have received *two* as my portion, and shall enclose them again to him. He surely thinks we are ignorant of what you have written, though he directs his sheets "*To the Readers of the Millennial Harbinger.*" We know what sort of a spirit animates a sectarian Priest, having tasted of the wormwood and the gall of sectarianism. He would make us believe, if he could, *you are our sectarian Bishop*, in the popular sense, and we are as much your servants as all the sects are the servants of the priesthood. Now be it

of this unclean document; and some of them have written to the aforesaid S. C. Jennings, (and all who have merited so much of his attention ought to acknowledge the favor he has bestowed upon them) informing him of the safe arrival of his circular. This is the high-minded and honorable spirit of the Presbyterian church militant, if it be right to take Mr. S. C. Jennings as a specimen: but of this we are in doubt. I have the honor to have as long a list of titles affixed to my name by these champions in the work of slander and detraction as graced the late Charles Lenox, Duke of Richmond. Like other persons of title, I ought modestly to say, that my aforesaid friends are too profuse of their honors. If they will only specify any action of my life, which, in their judgment, warrants the imputations of falsehood, dishonesty, or any of the high misdemeanors of which they accuse me, perhaps we might put them to the trouble to prove it before a tribunal where more than mere assertion, and the wantonness of ambition, or the bitterness of sectarian bile will be required. If Mr. Jennings finds his uncle's book a drug on his hand—(it has lately been sold at a very reduced price—indeed, one copy for 12 1-2 cents, within a few miles of me, and by a Presbyterian too)—if he is likely to lose, rather than gain, by selling *slander*, he ought not to seek to mend the matter, or to enhance its value, by reducing me so low, *else the book will not sell at all!*

I presume there has not been a more complete abortion than this whole "Debate on Campbellism," from first to last. While the preachers are packing it round the country—the editors puffing it East and West—and the whole church engaged in circulating it, it sinks like lead into the mire; and not even can the Rev. Matthew Brown, D. D. nor old Doctor M'Millan, nor our Nephew, keep it above ground. There are a few individuals who think it is the next book to "*the Catechism;*" but these are they who never read but "the Catechism" and "Marshal's Gospel Mystery of Sanctification."

Mr. Skillman, Mr. Cleland, and Mr. Jennings, from their recent zeal and enterprize, are furnishing us with unequivocal documents in proof of their fears and alarm on the spread of this infectious thing, called "*reformation.*" But their calumnies and reproaches will not long form a broad shield to avert the arrows of truth, and keep their people in the dark; for the reaction of public opinion will be in the increased ratio of the unrighteous means they have adopted to blind and bind them to the interests of the church—or, rather, the priests. This passing notice of their proceedings, and we proceed to the examination of a new edition of an old slander, which, because it is now fathered by the Uncle and the Nephew—by Mr. Skillman and Dr. Cleland, we shall call it

---

known to Mr. Jennings and all the sectarian priesthood on earth, we own no man as master or father on earth in spiritual things—Jesus Christ *alone* is our King—his word is our rule—his commands our law—his worship our delight—and we will not suffer any man to usurp a throne among us. T. M. H.

Jenning's and Cleland's New Discovery.

The last edition of the before mentioned slander is this:—"Though you are not represented as unlearned in every thing, and though I am no philosopher, I will explain" [how your heresy is spreading.] "Just as heresy has ever done, without either of these aids." [The *either* refers grammatically to but *two;* but there are *four* things proposed—talent, learning, moral character, and scriptural evidence. I know not which two of these he means.] "By its adaptedness to the views and inclinations of human nature, and by its affording the hope of heaven in an easy way." This will suffice for one essay.

I will ask the pardon of a certain class of our readers for not noticing in detail the numerous grammatical and literary blunders with which these Presbyterian Doctors abound. On the very title page of the "Debate on Campbellism" we have a singular blunder:—"In which the principles of Alexander Campbell are *confuted*"! *Refuted*, perhaps, he meant. We may confute a *person*, and refute *principles;* but how to confute, or convict principles, of error, requires more learning than I possess. But I mentioned in a former number, that we had a long list of these sins against grammar and propriety, extracted out of this work, which we did not think interesting to all our readers; and, indeed, we would not again mention the subject, if these Doctors did not profess to be judges of translations, critics, &c. These inaccuracies, and the vituperations that come from the *spleen*, we shall dismiss with the present apology, and proceed to the more serious task of examining the *allegata.*

The reason why the cause we plead (alias *heresy*) gains so much confidence, and spreads with so much rapidity, we are gravely told proceeds rather from *its affording the hope of heaven in an easy way*, than from talent, learning, character, or scriptural evidence.

Reader, you will please keep this assertion in mind. Our views are palatable, because "they afford the hope of heaven in an easy way"! Now, let me ask, comes it not in a very questionable shape from these Doctors to talk of "*an easy way*?"—these Doctors who will have all the fleshly seed of Presbyterian ancestors—of that peculiar blood, if in father or mother, I say, who *will* have all such children of Presbyterian flesh (and wherein is it better than yours or mine?) *carried* in the arms of the flesh into the very bosom of the church, even before the *sacred desk*, and the *holy bason*, to have it "ingrafted into Christ"? And does not the Creed say, (chap. xxviii.) "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ; not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church; but also to be unto him *a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins*, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life"? Now, I ask the most obdurate and intractable of my Presbyterian friends, whether the infants of the whole Presbyterian church (and they are not a few) do not find *an easy way of being engrafted into Christ*—of receiving the sign and seal of the whole covenant of

grace—of remission of sins and of regeneration too!!!! Was ever remission of sins, ingrafting into Christ, and regeneration, proposed on such *easy* terms? No faith in the subject—no repentance required. Presbyterian modesty, whither hast thou fled? You talk of an *easy way* of obtaining the blessings of the New Covenant; and who under the heavens offers salvation more cheap than you? Or is it your belief that baptism is *not* a sign and seal of the covenant of grace—is not a sign and seal of ingrafting into Christ—of regeneration?—is not a sign and seal of remission of sins? Why, then, publish it to the world as your faith?

Dr. Samuel Ralston charged me once with the crime of making salvation *too hard!* He said that it was an anabaptistical error to talk of having a pure church, or a church composed of regenerated men. No, he would have the tares and the wheat both growing in the church. His words are:—"The church of Christ was designed to embrace others besides saints, or persons regenerated, whose duty and privilege it is to attend on the ordinances of divine appointment, that they may be regenerated." How, then, can baptism be a sign of regeneration on this theory? From such *Doctors* may the good Lord speedily save the world! to say nothing of the church!?

Thus one Doctor says *it is not easy enough*, and another says *it is too easy;* and yet both make it as easy as carrying an infant to the bason and the priest!

But there never was a more unmerited slander pronounced upon any people, than the above. The brethren who preach the ancient gospel and urge the ancient order of things, so far from making the way to heaven more *easy* in the Presbyterian sense, do repudiate their system for no other reason in the world, but *because it proposes salvation without obedience.* Read the *Catechism*—read the *Creed:*—"Justification is an act of God's free grace;" "election is an act of God's free grace;" "sanctification is an act of God's free grace;" "adoption is an act of God's free grace;" and "faith is the gift of God;" and God, from all eternity, personally, and unconditionally, and unalterably decreed A, B, and C, to be heirs of glory, antecedent to, and independent of, any faith or obedience, repentance or reformation.

We, on the contrary, while we bless God for his mercy and favor abounding to us through his Son, say to all unregenerate men, "He that believes and is baptized, shall be saved; and he that believes not, shall be condemned;" and to the baptized we say, that Jesus has become the author of an eternal salvation *only* to all who obey him; and that without holiness of heart and life no man shall see the Lord. We exhort and beseech all the disciples to meet every Lords day to show forth the Saviour's death, to celebrate his resurrection, to keep all his commandments, and daily and hourly to cultivate personal and family piety; for unless there is a perfect heart, and a perfect devotion of the whole soul to Jesus Christ, we regard it all as the *form* of godliness without the *power.**

*See Epaphras, No. 6. and Reply.

Indeed, my grand objection to Presbyterianism more than twenty years ago, was the impunity which I thought it held out to disobedience, and the heartless manner in which it maintained a few forms and ceremonies. Had it been that *pure* and devout thing which these gentry would make it, I do not think my eyes would have been so soon, or, perhaps, at all, opened to its foolish rites and ceremonies; nor to so deep a sense of the need of reformation, especially among its preachers; for I know no men more in need of the regeneration of the heart, and a genuine conversion to God, than many of these priestly declaimers about the necessity of heart religion. Witness their words and their works!! EDITOR.

Epaphras---No. 6.

Dear Sir,

PROMPTED by a deep-felt interest in the reformation for which you so incessantly and extensively labor, I again take up my pen to address you upon this all-important subject; and shall proceed to state my apprehensions of the grand result of the proposed reformation, from what I have been able to ascertain of its practical influence upon the temper and conduct of the individuals, families, and societies that have professedly and practically embraced it.

In order to this, permit me to recall your attention, and that of your reforming brethren, to the professed object of the proposed reformation. Was it not the restoration of genuine apostolic Christianity, as expressly inculcated on the pages of the New Testament, both in faith and practice? Not in faith only, but also in practice? I mean in the whole tenor of conversation and conduct—in word and deed. That they who profess this reformation have all embraced the faith once delivered to the saints, without addition or diminution, they are all prompt to affirm. I do not recollect to have met with a single exception: and, not only so, but to prove it too, by showing that they heartily, and without equivocation or mental reservation, believe and assert every thing concerning God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and every expression of the divine will, and every ascription of glory, honor, and praise; and, in short, every divine declaration concerning every thing mentioned in the Holy Scriptures; and, of course, hold themselves bound to obey, in the plain, unequivocal, constructive meaning of the words and phrases, every thing enjoined by the Apostles upon the primitive disciples, as far as opportunity offers; that is, as far as circumstances will admit. Now, I must confess, that this is saying a great deal; and that, allowing the Scriptures to be a plain, honest, intelligible, and benevolent revelation; or communication of the divine will, for the present and future happiness of man, it would appear quite sufficient to answer every desirable purpose, even the grand end proposed; namely, the restoration of genuine apostolic Christianity. But, after all, I must confess, I feel disappointed as to the expected result; and am ready to inquire, "What do you more than others?" Individually considered, except the common morality,

which equally characterizes every consistent professor of every sect, what do the professed disciples of the primitive gospel more than others? Are they not as gay, as jocose, as worldly, as fashionable as their neighbors, all things considered? Where is their self-denying obedience, their edifying conversation and demeanor; their labors of love for the relief and comfort of the more indigent? &c. &c.—all which are so expressly inculcated in the apostolic writings.

Next, in passing from individuals to families composed of such individuals, the parents and guardians of which are also professed subjects of this reformation; the same question forcibly recurs—What do they more than others? Many of them, to my certain knowledge, I can assure you, come far short of the attentions to family edification, which prevail amongst the religious of other sects. I mean, the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures, with praise and prayer: which, indeed, may be done to but little purpose, unless accompanied with pertinent remarks, and edifying conversation upon the various important subjects which the Scriptures, when read with attention, always suggest. Add to this, that many of these families live as much to themselves, and to the world, as those who make no profession. Now as families are the nurseries of society, both civil and religious, if the proper and divinely appointed training be neglected, society becomes corrupted at the very fountain. The training up of families, therefore, in the correction and instruction of the Lord, according to Eph. vi. 4. Deut. vi. 6. & xi. 18, &c. is a duty of such radical—of such vital importance, that it appears just as reasonable to expect to find family health and comfort, without regular family meals, as to find a family enjoying christian health and comfort, without regular attention to the means divinely appointed for that purpose. Moreover, as Christianity, in the very spirit and principle of it, is of a social nature; every subject of it becoming, as such, a member of a divinely organized body; it is utterly inconceivable, how such can cohabit under the same roof, without daily and frequent intercourse in the very things, in which their chief gratification consists.

Lastly, as to the societies or churches of this reformation, as far as my acquaintance extends, I feel prompted to ask, What do they more than others? You will perceive by my repeated application of this practical question, to the professing subjects of the proposed reformation, individually considered, that I suppose they should do *more* than others. Most assuredly I do; for if otherwise, I must consider it a mere puff. But as to the churches I grant that a number of them meet every first day, and attend to all the instituted ordinances of Christian worship; but so do also other churches not professedly connected with the reformation which you advocate; and, except the weekly observance of the Lord's supper, thousands of churches, of different denominations, spend as much time in the public exercises of religion every first day, as any of the reforming churches of my acquaintance, and also contribute as liberally of their property for pious and charitable purposes. Again, you cannot be ignorant, that there are many of these churches called reformers, or reformed,

which meet but once or twice a month, and some of them which do not attend to the Lord's supper on all their first day meetings. But even suppose there were no such deficiencies, but that they all met every first day, and at every meeting attended to all the ordinances of Christian worship, would this amount to the proposed object. I anticipate your answer would be in the negative. No doubt you would feel disposed to inquire with me, Have all these members the same care for one another, that each has for himself, so far as respects the necessary comforts and enjoyments of life? Would you not feel disposed to ask, If one member suffers, do all the other members sympathize with it, and conspire, as far as possible, to afford it relief? Would you not ask, Are all the members personally and intimately acquainted with each other, as far as numbers and other circumstances will admit? Likewise, if there be any widows or orphans unprovided for —untaught? or, any poor families laboring under such privations? &c. &c.

Now, sir, I can assure you, there are some societies of the reformation, within the bounds of my acquaintance, that have attained to, what they conceive, a pure scriptural exhibition of gospel worship and order, in most, if not all of which, the supposed deficiencies, specified in the above queries, do really exist: and it is quite possible, that you yourself may have noticed such deficiencies. Is it so, then, after all the outcry and declamation we have heard against the sectarian corruptions of the Christian institution, that this specimen of pure, genuine, apostolic Christianity, which we have contemplated, and upon which we have been animadverting, is to be considered as the grand result of the boasted reformation, which is to introduce the halcyon era of the Millennium, and to constitute the glory of the latter day!!! I hope, sir, you will by no means understand this appeal to you and your associates in the arduous and desirable enterprize in which you and they are, I believe, conscientiously and honestly engaged, as intended to discredit or discourage the attempt; but, on the contrary, to prevent what appears to be the too justly apprehended catastrophe of your laudable exertions, provided something better than what has yet appeared, be not accomplished. For surely the ground you have taken is the dernier resort, the last practicable means that can be adopted to restore pure and undefiled religion, and Christian morality, to a corrupted sectarian world. Now, if this should fail, all is lost in irremediable hopeless impracticability; for, if taking hold of every sentence as it dropped from the Apostles' lips or pen, and was confessedly received and acted upon by the primitive disciples, will not restore us to true primitive apostolic Christianity, what would do it? We might, in such an event, well exclaim with David, "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" Surely if these fail when acted upon, all is lost. And is not this the very ground which you and your fellow-laborers have assumed? This awful consideration, then, (I mean the awful responsibility of the undertaking,) ought certainly to awake the utmost vigilance, the deepest interest in all concerned, not merely for their own sake, but for

the sake of the whole world. It is well shown in the course of your publications, that the failures of former attempts at reformation may be justly accounted for upon the ground of partiality, and of the intermixture of human opinions in the very foundation upon which they were superstructed. But should the reformation you so plausibly and emphatically urge, fail to produce the promised effect, to what must it be attributed? Certainly not to either of the above causes; for you exclude both.—The former, by assuming every thing taught and enjoined by the Apostles as matters of faith and practice—the latter, by excluding every thing of human opinion or inference from having any place in the constitution, faith, or worship of the Christian church. These are the very terms of the document lying before me, published in 1809, and republished, as appears from the copy before me 1832, with an appeal to all your readers, and hearers too, to point out a single instance of deviation from the above principle. These things being so, (and I assume not to dispute them,) to what must, and will we ascribe a failure to effect the thing proposed, if not to the utter and hopeless impracticability of the matter. Wherefore, as one sincerely desirous both of witnessing and enjoying the blissful fruits of the proposed reformation, I do most sincerely and repeatedly urge upon all concerned the above consideration of the unhappy and hopeless result of the apprehended failure. In the mean time, to prevent mistakes respecting the intention of the above animadversions, I freely declare that, in my opinion, both the object proposed and the means adopted to effect it, are divine and practicable; and that where any failure appears, it must neither be ascribed to the means nor the end, but to the manner and management, or rather, mismanagement of the agents. Is it asked, How or wherein does this appear? I would answer, In making the reformation, urged upon the public ear, to consist more in opinions than in faith and practice; that is, in the establishment of a more perfect scripture theory, than is proposed and taught by any of the existing sects; and, consequently, in disproving many of their leading and practical positions by establishing and enforcing the truth of their opposites. For instance, *baptism*, if you please; and here, the first thing, to prove the meaning of the term; the next, the import of the ordinance; and so, of course, to call persons to embrace it, or to submit to it for the end proposed—that is, for the remission of sins. Now, in as far as persons are induced to act upon this exhibition of the ordinance, they act upon premises very different, indeed, from those addressed to the primitive converts. The premises upon which they were induced, did not consist in a scriptural demonstration of the meaning of the word, and of the import of the ordinance; but upon a divine or scriptural demonstration of the divine character, of the actual character and condition of the hearers, of the amazing love, condescension, and mercy of God towards them in that condition, with the high and blissful consequence present and future, immediately resulting from the belief and obedience of these glad and joyful tidings, which directed all that believed them to be baptized forthwith in order to the

immediate enjoyment of the proposed salvation, and thenceforth to all that exercise of piety, of brotherly kindness, and love, recorded Acts ii. &c. &c. Now, I ask, is it not obvious, both from the premises and consequences before us, that these primitive converts proceeded upon principles very different from those which actuate the majority of the subjects of the present reformation, though they apparently confess and do the same things; I mean, with respect to baptism. The latter, for the most part, may, in a consistency with the premises upon which they are called to act, have only changed their opinion of the ordinance, and submitted to it that they might be pardoned; whereas the former, in consistency with the premises upon which they acted, must have commenced their Christian profession under the direct and immediate influence of the conviction of their guilty perishing condition, of the love of God towards them in that wretched condition, now manifested in Christ for their perfect and immediate relief, even the forgiveness of sins, the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, the adoption of sons, and the life everlasting; and thus they were led into a new family; the temper, the practice, the enjoyments, and character of which are described Acts ii. and elsewhere, to the end of the book.

Now, we know, that as much; yea, very much, depends upon a right beginning; so also, very much depends upon following it up in a proper and consistent manner: the first and last of the seven epistles addressed to the Asiatic churches, recorded Rev. ii. & iii. will amply suffice to illustrate and confirm this position. But I perceive I have exceeded. "He that has ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches."

Yours very respectfully,

EPAPHRAS.

☞Reply to Epaphras in our next. The number of documents on hand is so great, that we must postpone some of them till a more convenient season.

Address to the Virginia Baptists.

PART II.

Dear Brethren,

HAVING before shown my warrant to style you my brethren on account of all that enters into the essence of a Baptist, I will now add a few more reasons why I think I may do it with still greater propriety.

We both professedly believe the whole testimony of the Twelve Apostles—all the facts as they are on record—and the primary ones, as narrated in "the Apostles' Creed"!! We, in one summary, believe that "there is one body and one spirit, as we also have been called to one hope of our calling: one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and with all, and in us all."

We also agree that the Lord Jesus requires of us not only that we call him Lord and Master; but that we do all that he commands us. Now permit me to tell you, with all the solemnity and sincerity that there are in Christ Jesus, that this is the real ground of difference, as far as difference there is, between you and us: not, however, in acknowledging that we ought to do all that he

commands us; *but in the willingness to do, and in the attempt to do, all that he has commanded us.* Your preachers—(some of them I mean, and not a few of them,) have not only attempted to pervert, but have, to a certain extent, succeeded in perverting your minds, and in sophisticating the question, the great question which first called forth our energies. You have been led to believe that we are unsound in the faith, fond of some new theory, opposed to your views on speculative and argumentative grounds; that we plead for some undefined new system of opinions, &c. &c. Nay, Mr. Broaddus himself long since sounded a dread alarm among you, that we were aiming a deadly blow at the vitals—the very soul of piety. His "TAKE HEED," his "BEWARE," and his pastoral "ADMONITIONS" to you, have all been dictated by a jealousy which you may, if you please, call holy and devout; by a jealousy that we were unsound at heart, destitute of genuine piety—unacquainted with his peculiar work of the Spirit, and wholly natural and unregenerate; that we were privily bringing in some damnable heresies, and about to subvert the very pillars of the *spiritual* temple, of which you are spiritual stones; that we denied the Holy Spirit in some dangerous way—were either Unitarians, Arians, or some way heretical on the Trinitarian hypothesis—doubly dangerous, because of the excellency of many of our views; which were like the envelope to the poisonous pill, which was to work death in you, and prostrate all genuine piety and spirituality in the churches, &c. &c. &c.

Thus has the question been metamorphosed; and while we have been calling upon you to *reform*, for the day of vengeance upon corrupted Christianity is at hand, you have been taught to cry out *heresy!* and gravely told that *there is death in the pot!* Messrs. Clopton and Broaddus have, though with very different talents, and with a very different manifestation of temperament, physical and moral, worked these views and feelings into a considerable portion of your congregations; so that you are as completely blinded and perverted in mind on the real merits of the question we have been discussing, as ever was your Paidobaptist neighbors on the subject of infant sprinkling, by their ingenious guides.

I say, then, in the solemnity and sincerity which are in Christ Jesus, that we plead not for a mere change of views—for a new speculative creed; but for keeping the commandments—for *doing* the things which the Lord has commanded.

If any opinion has been attacked, it was because we saw in it some obstacle to your holiness and happiness. For example, in the 8th number, vol. 1 of the Christian Baptist, we attacked a popular notion of 'christian experience,' hazarded a controversy of ten years, provoked the *odium theologicum*, and all the vituperation of "the called and sent;" because we saw in that opinion an insuperable hindrance to your spirituality, holiness, and happiness. But in this attempt to awake your attention, and that of others, to the pathology of that moral disease, which so often and so long compelled you to exclaim, "My leanness! My leanness!" was it, think you, for the sake of establishing a new theory of conversion, or of Christian experience? No; but because we saw in the clear light of demonstration, that this notion of physical operations, or a conversion to God by some sudden impulse, *without the word*, and your *Christian experience before the Christian life began*, worked like a cancer upon the very vitals of Christian experience, properly so called.

Thousands we saw relying upon some "work of grace" experienced twenty years ago—upon some pangs, and fears, and calms, called regeneration—fast asleep in the cradle of *once in grace, always in favor*—confident that "he who had begun a good work in them would surely carry it on to perfection." Others in the same notion, but of a different organization, were reeling to and fro, under the intoxicating influence of evangelical pharisaism.

By that essay which appeared in vol. 1, C. B. were called forth nine essays in vol. 2, *"on the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men."* These essays were, however, commended in very high terms by your *Paulinus*, your *Christianos*, and your *Andrew Broaddus*. No one of the orthodox censured

them for what they did say; but some censured them for what they did not say. It is, however, difficult to decide whether we could have been more criminated for asserting the most flagrant errors on that subject, than for not asserting the favorite dogma of your teachers in the prescribed form of words which their Creed required.

For not asserting every word of the favorite dogma, we obtained the good reputation of being "an enemy to vital piety—destitute of heartfelt, experimental religion—an advocate of a religion without a change of heart," &c. Thus, while attempting to awaken your attention to the necessity of a thorough reformation of manners, and opposing your theory of conversion by miracle, and of Christian experience before obedience, because subversive, in our judgment, of genuine Christian experience—of the purity, and peace, and love, and hope, and joy there are in Christ Jesus—you were induced to consider us as new theorists, rather than as pleaders for a restoration of the Christian institutions, and of the piety and morality of the ancient disciples.

But our pen would never have disturbed the repose, called "the peace of the churches," had we not been compelled to regard it as deceitful and deathlike, rather than as the peace of God—the rest which is in Christ. Can it be the peace of God when the authority of his Son and the commandments of his Apostles are disparaged!—when human dogmas usurp the place of the Apostles' doctrine, and institutions merely human make void the ordinances of heaven! Could any Christian regard the peace of the Catholic church in the 12th and 13th centuries as the peace of God? Can any one now regard the peace of any fraction of any modern sect as the peace which Jesus bequeathed to his disciples? How, then, could any intelligent Christian regard the peace of which you boast, in the years 1820, —'21, —'22, as the peace of God?

Were you as zealous for all the commandments and institutions of the Messiah, as you are for "the subject and mode of baptism," we never would have found occasion to say one word about reformation. Your zeal for baptism is well known; because your existence as a sect depends upon the proper subject and action. But has not your zeal been wholly expended on this one commandment, so that the sanctification of the Lord's day, and the observance of the Lord's supper on that day, are matters of expediency rather than of divine obligation?

Do you not neglect the assembling of yourselves together on the first day of the week, except when curiosity prompts you to hear a sermon, or some new preacher?

Do you not allow one preacher to have the pastoral care of a plurality of churches?

Do you not pay him for preaching the gospel to you, and for leading in your worship; and allow him to receive pay from three or four churches besides, for performing for them the same services periodically?

Do you not in your meetings neglect the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and proscribe in the public assembly all gifts but the classic or assumed gifts of your preacher?

Do you not conform to the numerous traditions of the elders respecting covenants, creeds, and associations, which rest wholly upon human authority, to the neglect of those things plainly inculcated in the Epistles?

Are personal and family piety the distinguishing criteria of a Christian profession among you; or are there not in good standing in your congregations many who wholly neglect parental religious instruction, and the constant worship and praise of the Lord in their families?

Have sobriety, humility, justice, mercy, and the love of God been as highly prized, or as sedulously cultivated,as unity of opinion and soundness in theory amongst the members of your congregations

Are not the Baptists generally now much more conformed to the world, professing and non-professing; much more like the sects by them acknowledged to

be the descendants of Babylon the Great, than they are to those of your profession, twenty, thirty, or forty years ago? Is not a reformation in all these respects necessary?

But when we approach your ecclesiastical courts, your conventions, committees, associations, and advisory councils, are they not as tyrannical and oppressive, as proscriptive and unrighteous as any courts in America?

You seem to boast of the republican character of your institutions; yet what courts have gone farther than yours in condemnatory and extra-judicial proceedings?—Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Methodistic tribunals? No! not one of them!

If a person is accused of error in opinion or in practice in any other court, save yours, the charges are specified, and he is at liberty to defend himself. He may appeal to some other tribunal if he thinks himself oppressed; and can have an impartial hearing. But while you protest against superior courts and all appeals from the decisions of one congregation, you sometimes call in a council of churches to help you to condemn the arraigned; yet allow him no redress. Often the church is the accuser, witness, and judge in the case. How many hundreds of persons within a few years have been arraigned, condemned, and excluded for error in opinion, in your courts; not one of whom was willing to admit the indictment; yet were treated as if guilty of all? I repeat it, that no greater tyranny is known under this government, than was exercised by the last Dover Association; and shall in my next proceed, in due order, to state, illustrate, and prove it.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

"Wayne County, Ky. September 18, 1832."

[THIS letter was overlooked in in its proper time. We shall give a few extracts from it and some others laid over.]

"In the church at Monticello there are about sixty members. In that on Beaver Creek, about fifty. In that called the Gholson church, recently constituted, about thirty-four. We are going prosperously forward in the work of the Lord; seldom meet without having additions made to the family of God. About three weeks since we immersed an old lady, of good mind and sound understanding, 18 days advanced into her 90th year; she is the mother of sister Whitten, brother's wife of Christopher Greenup, former Governor of this state. She had been 45 years a member of the Methodist church. The Lord opened her heart, and she rejoiced to see the salvation of God."

J. C. FRISBIE.

Nicholasville, Ky. January 14, 1833.

It affords me much pleasure upon every proper occasion, to communicate or hear of the prosperity of Zion. In my letter to you a few days since, I informed you that I had immersed about forty here and neighborhood during the past year. Last Lord's day two weeks I immersed an old lady who is 71, for the remission of sins, near this. Yesterday morning I immersed two more, notwithstanding it was snowing very hard. Last night I spoke to a large collection of souls, about two miles from town. The subject was, the Gospel Proclamation. After the discourse an invitation was given to confess, which was urged upon the people; but no person came forward, and we were dismissed. After I had got out of the yard for home, a messenger came after me to return. I did so with as many of the brethren as had not yet went away, when a lady and gentleman made the confession. I asked if they would go the same hour of the night and be buried with their Lord. They said, 'We will go." Clothes were furnished, and off we marched through

snow and ice about a quarter of a mile. The banks were lined with spectators, some of whom held torches. Thus we teach the people to obey forthwith. I thank the Lord for our prosperity as a church, not only in adding souls, but in their growth of grace and the knowledge of the truth. We meet every Wednesday night to read and converse about the word; also, upon every Lord's day to break bread, read, exhort, contribute, &c. &c. and I can truly say, we have abundant reason to rejoice in God. May God speed the truth and success of his cause! Farewell.

GEO. W. ELLEY.

NICHOLASVILLE, KY, December 31, 1832.

Brother John Smith, who has been laboring as an evangelist during the past year with much success, has agreed to travel all 1833, the Lord willing.

In the extract which you made from my last letter to you, in the 11th No. of the Millennial Harbinger, you have mistaken the name John Rice for John *Brice*; and I feel solicitous that it should be corrected, because I should stand chargeable with a misrepresentation of facts, which I am unwilling to suffer, and which the good cause we are engaged in does not require in order to keep it up. GEO. W. ELLEY.

COLUMBIA, KY, September 1, 1832.

The reformation here is making gigantic strides, yet 'tis all done with the sword of the Spirit; and notwithstanding we have had severe opposition, at present we have a temporary calm by reason of the sectaries having to leave the field of investigation for want of fair and manly argument. I have thought many times an expression of yours has been verified in our opponents—that "the present reformation will either drive them to it, or into Paidobaptism." It does appear that some of our Baptist brethren had rather deny baptism altogether, than to acknowledge the well attested fact—"baptism for the remission of sins."

The church of Christ in this place, which was constituted about four or five months since, with seven members, numbers between forty and fifty. Brothers Stearman and Waters were among us in June, and refreshed us much in the Lord: and since that time between fifty and a hundred have obeyed the Lord in immersion. Nothing can impede the reformation but the reformers themselves; and I have really thought, brother, that if our teachers would exhort to holiness of heart more, times would be better. For the battle is won, our opposers have left the field, and given us full possession. I would like to see something to this effect in the Harbinger; I believe it would have a salutary effect. A. ALLEN.

MAYSVILLE, KY. January 18, 1833.

Brother David J. Burnett came among us a few days since, on a visit; since which time he has favored us with a few lectures on the subject of Christianity. We have abundant reason to thank God that the triumphs of the cross are still great, and that the labors of our brother have not been fruitless. Merchant Rowzee and Hatton, their wives, and another lady, (whose name I do not recollect,) have, disregardless of the frowns of the world and the intense coldness of the weather, manifested sufficient courage to take upon them that name in which alone there is salvation, by being baptized into the death of our Lord.

We rejoice exceedingly to see our friends realize that promise which Peter taught the Jews on the day of Pentecost, was to them and their children, and even to them who were afar off.

The above mentioned individuals, who, within the last few days have become living stones in the temple of Christ, are persons of intelligence and influence in the society of this place, which induces us to hope that some of their former associates will copy their example.

R. C. RICKETTS.

BRADFORD COUNTY, PA. October 29, 1832.

In the western part of this county there are now about three hundred disciples; fifteen have recently been buried with Christ in baptism, and more expected. Brethren Shepard, Sweet, Rockwell, Rogers, and some others are engaged in promulgating the truth as it is in Jesus, and their labors are blessed of God.

D. BULLOCK.

GERMANTOWN, KY. January 10, 1833.

I am sorry that your very useful paper has no more readers in this neighborhood; but more so, that there are so few students of the precious oracles of God. And I am much of the opinion, that those who are most studious of the Bible, are most fond of examining the Harbinger. For those who love to read God's word, love to read every thing written concerning it, tending to induce to a reading of it.

Within the last three months brother Abernathey has baptized twenty-four persons in the lower part of this (Bracken) county. At Germantown we are yet in a disorganized state, notwithstanding we have a *name* that we *live*. May the good Lord help us to reform, and bless, with us all who love his name!

J. H. HOLTON.

FALMOUTH, KY. January 5, 1833.

Since the middle of October last, in the section of country where I live, I have received into membership and baptized fifty persons for the remission of sins. The gospel is bearing down all opposition in this part of the country.

WILLIAM WALTERS.

STREETSBOROUGH, O. January 16, 1833.

Brother Campbell—I have just returned again from a cruise, and have captured six vessels to the Lord. We are on the gaining hand with the sects; but laborers are needed more than any thing else. True Christian character and enterprize among the churches must do every thing in the neighborhoods where disciples live; but the converts cannot do without help. We find that where there have been most constant instructions the cause does best.

In many new places the prospect is very good, especially in the town of Brunswick, Medina county. Two months ago I left the Debate with Owen there. Five weeks afterwards I spoke there, and found a number much taken with the book; conversed with several till midnight; was there two days ago, and although a Methodist three days meeting was held there at the time, I had a goodly number to hear two speeches. In the first, showed the object of all good governments is the good of the people; but, however wise and good the object, people enjoyed the benefit only in obedience. Instanced Washington as the deliverer and lawgiver of his country, and the superior happiness of the American people, only by obeying the constitution and laws. Showed the happiness of Israel, through obedience to the government of Moses, their saviour and legislator. Showed Jesus to be a king, deliverer, lawgiver; that he is no tyrant; his laws good in their design; and their wisdom consists in being the best ways and means to effect their objects—that the glory of a King consists in the happiness and peace of his kingdom.

Second speech—showed how God purifies the heart in obeying; or, in other works, how he makes sinners live here by forgiving their sins. The effect was visible with many, especially a Presbyterian Deacon, much respected, and a Methodist of first standing, who requested to be immersed; but as there was no water convenient, they concluded to defer it till I am there again, when they will go with me six miles, where I expect some others to obey. Mr. Fisk's (the Methodist) wife, immersed by the Baptists in New-York, is also coming over. She is the only person that ever asked me to speak on baptism on first seeing me; but as I hope to see you in March, I shall say no more at present.

WILLIAM HAYDEN.

VINCEENES, IA. December 10, 1832.

I have returned home; and on yesterday, at Bruceville, I was appointed by the brethren a messenger of the churches, to travel among them, proclaiming the word of life, the message of God's philanthropy to all who will hear it. May the God of all grace bless their humble labors. On yesterday also I immersed four into Jesus Christ for remission. And on this evening I am to make my debut in this sectarian, Roman Catholic, and infidel town. May my God help me! I know my own ignorance and inability to perform this great work; and from this you may form some idea of our necessity in this region. This is probably the best that can at this time be done here. I am now more than ever impressed with the belief of the necessity of praying the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into the fields. To me it is, indeed, a matter of sorrow that your unworthy brother is the only one that can be induced to ride constantly in this country; but under all these disadvantages it is encouraging to know that the brethren generally are hearty in the cause. They well know who gives the increase, and I believe their prayers will be answered.

M. R. TRIMBLE.

CINCINNATI, O. October 16, 1832.

My dear Brother—I am happy to inform you that since my return to this place I have immersed more or less every Lord's day—the exact number I cannot say—twenty-five or thirty. On last Lord's day I immersed also eleven, and some others are in readiness to obey. I think that a very general spirit of inquiry has been awakened among us, and that we may reasonably expect here and throughout this region of country, a goodly increase to the number of the Lord. We are greatly in need of some half dozen intelligent, zealous, and wise proclaimers of the gospel among us, to go forth in all directions from this city. The country is, indeed, ripe for the harvest, but the laborers are few. Since my return I have had persons to travel here 30 and 40 miles to obey the gospel, who have carried the good seed of the word home, and are dispersing it among their neighbors.

Brother Scott is still in bad health, and my labors are necessarily confined almost exclusively to the city.

The Cholera is among us, and is raging with considerable violence; the disease, however, is not so fatal now as it was a few days since.

JAMES CHALLEN.

CINCINNATI, O. January 14, 1833.

Brother Campbell—I have the pleasure of informing you that I have just returned from a visit to the Rising Sun, a small village in Indiana, 40 miles below this city; in which place I labored in word and teaching for three days, and immersed twenty-one persons. In the last month, on a visit to the same place, I immersed sixteen persons, and collected the disciples who were residing in the place into one body, who now agree to meet on the first day to attend to the institutions of the Lord. The congregation of disciples have agreed to build a one-story meeting house, and already have nearly a sufficient quantity of materials and money subscribed to accomplish the object. Since my return to this place last July, I have immersed about fifty persons in the city and vicinity.

With great confidence of success in the cause we plead, I remain your brother in the Lord.

JAMES CHALLEN.

SHELBYVILLE, KY. December 18, 1832.

The cause of reformation is spreading in our little village. Since I last wrote you we have increased in number. We are now seventy-two—all warm hearted disciples, marching like a band of soldiers—not afraid of our views—for I discover all denominations are sliding imperceptibly into our views. Brothers Fleming and Fall are our preachers. The former is a good recruiting officer, and the latter a great teacher.

G. W. NUCHOLS.

RISING SUN, IA. December 22, 1832.

Brother Challen, of Cincinnati, visited us agreeable to request on last Lord's day, and spoke to the people concerning the things of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour. This being done on Bible grounds and terms, sixteen persons became convinced of the necessity of obedience before regeneration, made the good confession, and were baptized or immersed into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, for the remission of their sins.

Brother Challen is the first proclaimer of the ancient order of things who has visited us. Should his success be known, I hope some of the travelling brethren will find it convenient to call and continue the good impression among the people toward this order of things, which brother Challen has left on their minds. JOHN B. CRAFT.

MURFREESBOROUGH, TEN. October 8, 1832.

Lately the *Concord* Association of Separate Baptists have had a meeting. Brothers Peyton Smith, C. Curtis, and others of the reformation, were members of the Association, and went up to it, that they might get clear, or, as brother Smith remarked to it, "Wash his hands of all such filth," and escape a publication. After some contention about it, the brethren received letters of dismission in full fellowship, but were voted down so as to be excluded from preaching in the house. This was done, I am informed, (for I was not there,) by bringing two or three who did not belong to the Association, and who served their dirty purposes. The brethren, (without giving any formal or public declaration of their intention,) retired to a neighboring grove, half a mile off, and addressed an audience that followed them, and four professed faith. One intelligent lady was immersed; and others, for want of necessary apparel, put it off a few days. All have yielded thus before you get this letter.

The members of *Concord* continued to belabor themselves, and adjourned without a convert to their folly. Such is the *discord* of *Concord*; such the efficacy of human inventions to bind and keep together a jarring world. O that men would cease making laws for each other, and be governed by the laws of King Jesus!

The opposition here is (as I expect it is elsewhere) revelling greatly in the triumphant refutation by Dr. Jennings. I have read the book, and setting aside the absolute (innocent I suppose) misrepresentations of the Doctor, I think the total ignorance he displays of the object of the various divisions of the Scriptures, is enough to make Presbyterianism itself blush.

The author of "*75 cents worth of slander*" seems to think, or to have thought, that he might take any part of the word (from the Old or New Testament) and apply it to the present heterogeneous condition of men, calling on them at the same time to receive it all as directly addressed to them: or, in other words, he makes no difference in speakers or hearers, times or circumstances. He would have addressed a Philippian jailor, who never had heard of Jesus, just as he would the audience of Jews at Solomon's Portico, who had not only heard of him, but probably been witnesses to his martyrdom; and would even in this reading day have addressed neither as the Apostles did. He had forgotten that John the Dipper was greater than Moses, and that the humblest Christian is greater than John; and hence he strives to make Moses' writings obligatory on the disciples of Jesus!

The Doctor, like many others, (if he were on earth,) could be taught by Priscsllas (as was Apollos) the ways of the Lord more perfectly. It is distressing, indeed, to hear one of "the called" stultifying their hearers, who do not believe the gospel, with quotations from the Epistles, a part of the oracles of Heaven addressed exclusively to the members of Christ's body; nor is it less irksome to hear them lecture a congregation from some of the historic parts of the Testament, urging upon them faith in a *triune God*, that they may be saved. Few of them, indeed, seem to know that the four first books of the New Testament were written, as John says, that men might believe,

or as evidence or proof that Jesus was the Christ; that Acts were written to show men, after they had faith, how they might enter into Jesus' kingdom and obtain pardon from their condemned situation; or that the Epistles were written exclusively for the government, instruction, and encouragement of the disciples. Hence I think has arisen much of the confusion of this discordant day; and Dr. Jennings seems to have been as ignorant of these natural divisions as he was redundant in broad epithets and unargumentative abuse. Did the limits of a letter admit of it, it would be no difficult matter to show in his refutation, where he in speaking or writing (for he has written things in his book which he did not speak) of the sinner, has wrested from its connexion passages to the adopted sons of God, to those who by obedience had been constituted his kings and priests; and he has acted contrarywise also. Now if there be so little difference between the saint and sinner, as that language spoken to one is applicable to the other, or that addresses to them may be indiscriminately used, why make so much ado about christianizing the heathen, about theological seminaries, and the immense advantages accruing to the believer? or what has the world gained, or how much is it benefited by all the efforts of all such learned and pious men as the good O. Jennings, D.D. Language you know is used to express our ideas; and if our ideas of the two states are such as that one address is applicable to both, where is the difference in our ideas of them, or what advantage in our mind's eye has one over the other?

As triumphant as they think Doctor Jennings' book to be, and it is in the hands of almost all the orthodox, not one of them will meet any of us in public discussion of any thing; and yet whenever those who are their subjects do occasionally venture to hear for themselves, they are apt to return; and in two-thirds of the cases, in this county, when they have heard the ancient gospel half a dozen of times, they have obeyed it. *Mem.*—The teachers of the sects say they will not meet us to dispute about religion, because, forsooth, it is unchristian-like, [how unlike a Christian was Paul!] and yet they will abuse us just in proportion to what is taught by our brethren. Which is most like a Christian—to abuse a man, or a doctrine, without allowing of a defence; or calmly to meet opposition, and, if able, to subvert it?

Our litile congregation here meets every first day. Great harmony prevails with the brethren. The cause of the Redeemer is unquestionably gaining rapidly the attention of the thoughtful and the reading part of the community. Those who do not read, and will not hear, remain as credulous and duped and intolerant as their magi could wish them. F. E. BECTON, Jr.

LOCUST SHADE, West Tenn. Nov. 25, 1832.

Reformation, in this part, is progressing tolerably well. I have had but a small portion of my time to devote to public teaching—not more than the first day, and this to the people of my own vicinity. Brother J. Mulkey, an efficient teacher, lives near me, and has rode extensively during the present year, and done great good.

I delivered two discourses last month, in my neighborhood, upon the mission of the Apostles to the world, and the subject of the Spirit, and the effect was great and good: twelve persons made the apostolic confession, and were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins. Since then, I have immersed one more. W. D. JOURDAN.

FRANKFORT, Ky. Dec. 6, 1832.

So far, I have gone by the appellation of a Baptist preacher; and my course in teaching has been, to read a portion of the oracles, (a chapter—sometimes less) and deliver a discourse, entering into the nature of the circumstances connected with the subject, the writer, or speaker, and in the conclusion to urge the claims of the gospel on sinners to obey it, and christians to observe the law of Christ. I have rarely entered into any of the controversies about the different doctrines taught by human teachers in their schemes, which are

taught in almost every place where I have been. In this way I have escaped many severe men, who would have been so under other circumstances; but by taking advantage of their prejudices, I think good has been accomplished: not that I have been timid, or afraid to declare in opposition to human gospels, (for I have found many) but knowing, that if the *true* were taught, then the others would surely fall.

In the course of my travelling, I have visited many of the large cities, and I have always observed a great difference in the religious communities. This, no doubt, proceeds from the different systems taught, and not from the gospel alone. I think I have learned many things which will be valuable to me in after life. Of one thing I am persuaded, at least,—that sectarianism is gradually sinking, and just in proportion to the march of truth. In many places where Sunday schools are carried on, and the children are instructed in the word of God without their catechisms, I find their mind appears free. In almost every part of the country where I have been, your works are read; and where they are not, I have found the people inquiring. The light is advancing.

I have lately been with brethren Morton and Allen, in Jefferson county, and Oldham. They immersed about eighty persons, in a few weeks. At Shelbyville and Newcastle, others were immersed. Brother Johnston, of Georgetown, and brother Fall, constituted a church here, on last Lord's day, of eight persons, who are persons of high respectability. The brethren in the opposition have become much more friendly than formerly. The reform, I suppose, has received an addition of five, this year, to every one of all the other sects.

JOHN R. McCALL.

Cloyd's ⋈ Roads, Campbell county, Ky. Jan. 15, 1833.

I have situated myself at this place for the winter, and perhaps longer. Only a few months ago, a church was constituted here, of some six or seven disciples: additions have swelled the number to nearly fifty. They are moving on in the worship and service of the Lord. They meet every first day to break bread, &c. They are still in a growing state. The meeting house is on the road leading from Cincinnati to Georgetown, Ky. 25 miles from Cincinnati.

S. K. MILTON.

Bellefonte, Centre county, Pa. Jan. 1, 1833.

Ninety persons, in all, in this vicinity, this summer, have been immersed for the remission of sins, upon a profession of their faith. These persons will constitute two churches—one called the Buck Creek Church, and the other the Bald Eagle Church. The Buck creek church has already commenced its walk as a church, with the ordinances among them. The prospects of doing good, in this country, are truly flattering; all that is wanting is honest hearted proclaimers, of understanding and prudence.

NATHAN J. MITCHELL.

Connersville, Ia. Jan. 10, 1833.

Through much persecution, the "ancient gospel" has progressed steadily, but slowly, since the year 1829, when it was first generally announced through this country.

In the month of September, (last) we engaged brother John O'Kane, to devote his time to the work of an evangelist. This event marks a new era in the reformation. Since that time, numbers have become obedient to the faith.

Brother O'Kane is an eloquent man, and powerful in the scriptures; and will, no doubt, be very useful in the capacity in which he is now acting. In this small county (Fayette) there are four congregations of disciples who acknowledge no law, in matters of religion, but that of Christ the King; and another will shortly be formed, in this village.

Brother O'Kane informed me, on the 8th inst. that since Christmas, he had witnessed the good confession of twenty-five persons, who had presented themselves to be immersed for the remission of sins.

The sects, whom you may imagine to have but little attraction for each other naturally, have united in adopting measures to oppose the progress of reform. This is strong evidence of the weakness of their creed, when exposed to the light of divine truth. Their "divine right" to form a creed and impose it on the consciences of their adherents, appears to be the common property of all the sects, and they are very jealous of invasions of it.

The cause of TRUTH is prevailing, and will prevail, till the wide world shall shout the good news, "Babylon the Great is fallen, never more to rise!"

R. T. BROWN.

RUTHERFORD COUNTY, Tenn. Dec. 17, 1832.

Persecution runs high—we are called Campbellites, schismatics, deists, &c. But these things are scarcely worth naming: we have not yet resisted to blood, been beaten with rods, or even striped.

Since my last communication, I have immersed, for the remission of their sins and introduction into the kingdom of God, about 140 persons, many of whom stand in front in point of intellect. Of this number, I am happy to say, I have heard of only one man who by his works declares himself an enemy to holiness; but this one, you may rest assured, has been the means of much abuse being heaped upon us.

We had a four day meeting at Rock Spring, which commenced on the Saturday before the fourth Lord's day in November last. It was, indeed, a refreshing season. The brethren who took the lead in public speaking, appeared to have only one great object in view—that was, to do their Father's will. Thirty-two were immersed upon the good profession, and six others united with us, who had previously been immersed. Among the number baptized in a few months past, there were four of my own family, making ten in my house. Dear brother, I never knew what it was to be so abused, and I never knew what it was to be so happy!

I have literally given myself to the public, without money or price. I do this day thank God that I have lived to learn the truth with regard to christianity; that my mind has, in some good degree, been relieved of its vulgar prejudices, enthusiasms, and, may I not say, fanaticisms?

Dear brother, the cause is the Lord's. Be stedfast, immoveable; always abounding in the work of the Lord: knowing, that your labor will not be in vain, in the Lord.

Accept Mrs. Smith's christian affection.

Farewell, for the present. PEYTON SMITH.

[A letter from brother Fanning, besides stating the particulars of the meeting at Rock Spring, also informs us, that he had immersed three in the borders of the Chickasaw nation.]

To the brethren of the Reformation:—

BELOVED BRETHREN—Your respective places of address are not known to us, or we would send directly to you, asking you to come to Painesville, and the neighboring meeting houses in Amelia county, Va. and aid us in the work of the Lord.

We are yet in our infancy, struggling with opposition; yet we humbly hope we grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We earnestly request your co-operation with us. Letters addressed to our Pastor, P. L. Townes, Office Tavern Post Office, Amelia, will meet with prompt attention. [Signed] P. L. TOWNES.

We hoped to have brought up to the present date the good news communicated from so many quarters. Interesting documents from New York, Virginia, and other states, must lie over to our next No.

History of the Reformation.

IN reply to frequent enquiries and suggestions about writing the history of the present reformation, we would at this time only observe, that, in our judgment, it would be wholly premature now to attempt any thing of the sort. Let us first see a reformation in fact —a reformation in sentiment, in practice—a reformation in faith and manners, before we talk of writing a history of it.

All that could now be written, would be rather the history *of a struggle for reformation*, than the history of a reformation. When it shall have been ascertained how far the primitive institutions have been restored, and a gospel reformation effected, it will be time enough to enquire how it was effected. We have, indeed, all the documents, and can hand them over to others; and I will farther say, that they shall be preserved. Having had a perfect understanding of all matters from the very first, being placed in circumstances which obliged us to have all the documents on file, if ever it should be thought profitable or expedient to have them published, they shall, as far as we can take care of them, be forthcoming. It is, moreover, intended to have them assorted and filed in regular order, during the current year.

But, as before observed, it would be exceedingly incongruous to do more than preserve the documents till we ascertain, or posterity ascertain, in what, and how far, we have restored the apostolic institutions. Besides, it is to be hoped that none of the present actors on this great theatre of reform, are seeking their own glory. Nothing could be more incompatible with the genius of the gospel; nothing more hostile to the spirit of Jesus, (who always taught that humility precedes honor,) than such a spirit:—the very appearance of it is to be deprecated as a pestilence. The great Teacher taught,—and may we all learn the lesson, it is an index to the hearts of men—"Whoever teaches what proceeds from himself, seeks to promote his own glory; whoever seeks to promote the glory of him who sent him, deserves credit, and is a stranger to deceit."

Were there a full and faithful history of this attempt at reformation published, some who have not courted renown, but kept themselves out of sight, would appear to have been most efficient agents in furthering the work. They have been so modest in their pretensions, and so unobtrusive in their proceedings, that society knows not how much it is indebted to them. To him alone who remembers the time when only brethren P. S. Fall, of Kentucky, and Adamson Bentley, of Ohio, cordially espoused the cause, can the services which such brethren rendered, appear in their true light. These brethren, in various respects,—well known to me by their early espousal of the cause of reform, by their sacrifices of popularity, by their patient endurance of many trials, by their personal labors in the word and teaching, by the moral influence of their example, and the power of their instructions,—have contributed very much to the cause of reform; and, consequently, have much higher claims upon the grati-

tude and admiration of all the brethren, than most of them are aware of. To one who is perfectly acquainted with the many incidents, contingencies, and various occurrences in the history of any interesting subject, agencies of all sorts will appear in their true character; and such a person not unfrequently observes the whole destiny of an enterprize depending upon the timous or fortunate intervention of some agent, or agency, of which the great community of spectators may be wholly ignorant. Were we writing a history of these matters, many such developments could be made, and several names, which seldom appear in print, would stand conspicuous in forwarding the work of the Lord.

But many of this class will scarcely permit their names to be mentioned. A brother who often writes to me under the injunction of secrecy, and who I doubt not will appear in high repute when the King comes in his glory, said, on a late occasion, "I wait for my reward, and my honor, till the resurrection of the just." Another who has been most instrumental in this reformation, lately said to me, "If the Lord will forgive me all my mistakes and errors in pleading the cause of reform, I shall be perfectly satisfied, and esteem myself most happy in having essayed to do good."

Let us, then, every man to his post, do the work of the Lord faithfully, and leave it to others to tell of it; or rather, let us wait the day when every man shall have his praise from God, who judges not after the manner of men, and who will most certainly render to every man his proper reward. EDITOR.

QUERIES.

"HOW many times may a Christian get drunk before he can be called a drunkard; and be put out of the church agreeably to Paul's directions?"

Answer.—Most men have constitutional infirmities, as well as those superinduced by habit. A person may be accidentally overtaken once or twice in a fault, who is not habitually subject to it. Other circumstances than the mere number of times any action is committed must decide the character of a man. Misers have sometimes been liberal, and liberal persons have sometimes been miserly. Some men who are seen drunk only once, may, because of indulgence almost habitual, be more worthy of the character of a drunkard, than one who has been oftener overtaken. Some men by degrees overtake a fault, and others are overtaken by it. The former deserve the character more than the latter; but Christian prudence is always necessary to decide. If a brother has sinned more than once in this indulgence, and been restored on confession of repentance, should he be again detected in it, confidence is measurably lost, and more explicit evidences of contrition are requisite; and when oftener repeated it will require experiment rather than confession, to authorize a cordial

restoration. For my own part, I can hardly regard a person as sincere in his confession of sorrow for repeated drunkenness, unless he promise to abstain from the appearance of this evil by a total abstinence from his enemy. He that cannot command his appetite when the enemy is out of sight, cannot do it in its presence: for he who cannot keep the enemy out of the citadel, need not expect to overcome him when he has gained admission. Therefore, he who says that he regards drunkenness as a sin, and his enemy, *and will not keep out of its way*, affords no evidence that he is sincere in his protestations of sorrow. ED.

"In what light are we to view those things which Paul wrote by permission, and not by commandment?"

Answer.—As the judgment of an able counsellor, well skilled in all the principles of the Christian religion; but not, as he himself says, as of the authority of express commandments or revelations from God. ED.

"What does our Lord mean by "The servant abides not always in the house, but the son abides always?"

A.—A servant, whether bond or free, has no permanent interest in the family; he is not connected with its head by blood, and therefore the perpetual ties of consanguinity unite him not to its interests. But the son has a permanent natural interest which time never impairs. Moses was a servant in another person's family; but Christ is a son over his own family. Moses continued in God's family officially only for a time, but the Messiah always. ED

"The Presbyterians in our neighborhood assert that the first day of the week is always called "the Sabbath" in the original Greek. I have examined my Greek Testament to know the truth of the assertion; but the superficial knowledge I acquired of that language when a boy, by neglect, has escaped me. Will you give me your opinion on the subject, either by letter or in one of your numbers?"

Answer.—They who say so, have worse than forgotten all their Greek; for it never is once called *the Sabbath* in the Apostles' writings. *Sabbaton* signifies a week, as every one acquainted with Helenistic Greek knows; and *Mia Sabbaton* is the phrase which all translators render "the first of the week," or "first day of the week." ED.

To Querists.

MANY queries requesting information on some phrases and words in the New Testament, are on hand. It would require many pages to answer them all. Some of them shall be noticed in the Harbinger; but in the Appendix to the Family Testament, most, if not all of them, are anticipated, and to that work we must refer such of our readers as have many such difficulties on hand. After that work is carefully examined, we shall answer all questions of a practical nature, which may be sent us, as fully and as promptly as possible.

EDITOR.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Number III.——Volume IV.

Bethany, Va. March, 1833.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'Corkle,—*a Layman.*

(Continued.)

MOST of the prophecies have a two-fold meaning, and are to have a second accomplishment:—the first was on the Jewish church; the second will be on the Gentile. The character and fate of the one, is that of the other. The analogy will hold good in every prominent feature. It was said of the former, "They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money; yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us." Could a more striking portrait of the present administration be drawn? We read the character of the present church, in the past; in the name of reason, why not its fate? Have we any warrant, that on the present, the dreadful contrast is not to be consummated in the same degree that the one dispensation exceeds the other in light, magnitude, extent, and corruption? And these dreadful events are to find the world as illy prepared for them, as it was for the flood; or the Jewish church was for the last dreadful catastrophe which closed its political existence, as

well as its existence as a church. And just as sure as there is truth in the Bible, such a day of calamity, of sore visitation, is hanging over the Gentile church, for the one, self-same cause—incurable corruption.

Some may say there is much good doing in the world. Compare the good doing with the abounding wickedness, with the increase of crime, and the subject presents but a gloomy prospect. I admit there are partial revivals; but how short-lived are they, forever quenched by the hand of partyism, with endless broils about enlistments, enrolments, &c.? And this growing evil is never to cease until the present order of things is rolled up like a useless scroll, and laid aside with all its appendages. I grant there is good doing, partial good, or we should soon have the vials of the wrath of Almighty God.

Time has not yet rolled round the number of years allotted to the reign of antichrist. The four winds are not yet fully let loose.* The accumulating storm is held in "straitened reins," till the servants of God be sealed in their foreheads. What may we then expect! But blind credulity, and the "downy Doctors," will say, We are in the hands of a merciful God: 'Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us.' So said the antediluvian, so the Jew, until they were awakened up from their delusions by irreparable ruin. Men will frame a thousand excuses, or objections, rather than examine these matters, and will console themselves that these things are not to happen in their day. What ruin has attended the close of former dispensations by such delusions as are now closing the eyes of the mass of mankind! The day, the very hour which will usher in the terrors of Omnipotence, will find men slumbering, dreaming, hoping these things are not to take place in their day. And what are our watchmen doing at this important crisis—a time which is to furnish with a wedding garment, or a dreadful "Depart you"?—Feeding their famished flocks on stale divinity; dealing out a weakly dole of dry dogmas; or ransacking hell for horrors, by which to frighten people into heaven, instead of obeying the gospel in its plain and simple precepts—converting the *blood*, inundating the world with periodicals, *religious novels*, *tracts*, *fables*, *lies;* fabricated in falsehood, and vended in corruption. Shame on Christianity! Has truth lost its efficacy? Has the Bible no charms, that fiction is dressed up in its stead, in nice attire, to suit the vitiated taste of Christendom? And some of these potent *tracts* are famous for converting hundreds!

Now, serious reader, which do you think God prefers, a *lie*, or the *truth*, by which to convert men? They have corruption at the bottom, and stand in the dark catalogue of allegations against the present administration.

---

*If the cholera be not a pestilence, what may we call it? Has any disease ever made such a formidable attack on the human family, so rapid in its march, so dreadful in its operations, and so completely setting the skill of man at defiance to find a cause? God has begun his controversy; his footsteps are visible; the four winds are beginning to "hurt the earth." Other judgments will follow in close step. When God begins a work, it will be consummated in the plenitude of his power—the scourge, the last resort of heaven!

The good doing at present in the churches, is like some momentary and strong pulsations about the heart, when life has entirely left the extremities. Not only disease, but age has contributed its influence toward weakening all the energies of the body; and these energies, divided into a thousand different channels, are forever striving to render the efforts of each other abortive. Think you the Jewish administration was nothing impaired by age? Every thing we see on earth, is preaching the self evident doctrine of decay, of dissolution.

What but the elements maintain their grouud unchangeable, unaffected by the mighty roll of succeeding ages? All governments, civil or ecclesiastic, where erring man has had the administration, have been subject to the one invariable fate, disease and death. Governments never renovate, nor is the stamp of eternal duration fixed on any.

Most of the mighty empires which have been, exist only on the page of history; they are buried and lost amidst succeeding revolutions. Where the nation that has stood the wreck of time? Where the empire that holds its head above the mighty wave which has beat down the strength of nations, and annihilated the power of thrones and dominions? The Lord of hosts has fixed the destiny of all: "He looked, and drove the nations asunder." How visionary, to look for institutions unchangeable, incorruptible, where man administers! The elements alone know no change. That which comes into existence, must go into dissolution. A church existed before the flood:—where is it? Buried beneath the mighty waters—for corruption. The administration was then committed to the Jewish nation: has it shared a better fate? it is now standing a blighted monument of divine displeasure—for corruption. Now, taking Christendom in the aggregate, is it less corrupt than the churches which have fallen? Is God pledged to the present Gentile church in stronger terms than he was to the Jewish? Is the Gentile church profiting by the history of the past, or examining the ground on which she is standing?

ANALOGY BETWEEN THE JEWISH & GENTILE CHURCH.

There is a close and striking analogy between the Jewish and Gentile church. The Jewish economy was a shadow of things to come; had its law-giver, its twelve patriarchs, its ordinances, its holy fire, spirit of prophecy, power of working miracles, or demonstration; its Babylon.

The Christian church had Christ a law-giver, twelve Apostles, its Holy Spirit, spirit of prophecy, ordinances, demonstration, &c. its Mystery—Babylon. All admit the former to be a type of the present. If this be true, how far must the antitype agree with the type? In all its points and bearings, or it is not perfect. If each had its day of persecution, its day of perfection and glory, its day of corruption and captivity, who may assert, without a special warrant from God, that the Gentile church is not to complete the analogy, and close with a like visitation?

If the past were a type of the present, the present must close as did the past. The same fate awaits, the same ruin is unavoidable, as long as the character of the one is that of the other. We may close our eyes to these things, and hope a better fate, regardless of analogy, of prophecy, or the invariable dealings of heaven. Will closing the eyes ward off the shafts of Omnipotence? Will ignorance avail us any thing, when the ministers of God's vengeance are let loose to scourge a guilty world? To those who look for him, and those alone, will he come the second time "without sin to salvation." A remnant are to be saved, no doubt, by the special hand of God, who will discriminate, in the day when he arises to "shake terribly the earth," between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serves God and him that serves him not.

If the Jewish church understood the prophecies relative to the coming of Christ, so will the Gentile church those relative to his second coming, or his Universal Reign. If the Jew was in a state of preparation for his first advent, so will the Gentile be for his second. The reason may be given by a similar question: if the teachers, the priests of the former, were declaring the whole counsel of God, keeping themselves unpolluted from bribes and blood, so will the present be found. Reader, finish the analogy. As far as the two have gone, they perfectly agree.

I speak in general terms, taking Christianity upon the whole. In the one were found a few Israelites in whom there was no guile; in the other will be found a few wise servants, watching, waiting the return of the Master. Now, on the principles of analogy, may we not expect to see priest and people seized with the same infatuation which possessed priest and people at the close of the past? Do we not see the same spirit, the same misguided zeal, the same invincible attachment to tradition, the same misapplication of prophecy, the same scepticism relative to the setting up of Christ's Universal Reign? The Jewish priests applied predictions relative to Christ's reign to temporal government, expected an earthly potentate: the priests of the present order apply all the predictions standing unfulfilled to the close of time, the final judgment, and another state of existence.

If dispensations have closed, may they not close again? I challenge the proof, the text, the single text, within the lids of the Bible, which will warrant the hope, the belief, that the present is not to close. On what reed of hope are we hanging? On bare presumption, on mere perchance that God will not do as he has done formerly; that he will no more scourge the world for corruption; that lawless discord is to drive with slackened reins and headlong fury; that the tide of vice is to know no check; that the rights of man are to be disregarded; that the cries of the oppressed are no more to enter into the ears of the Lord of hosts; that the fetters of tyrants and slavery are to be riveted for eternity; that millions of God's creatures are to serve the few; that power is to be the rule of right: that men, whom God and nature made free, are to be "hammered to the galling oar for life, and plough the winter's wave, and reap despair;" to bear the extremes

of cold and heat, hunger and nakedness; freighted, sold, bartered, regardless of affinities, or the endearing name of father, mother, or child; Christians sold by Christians to the highest bidder! Are these things phantoms, chimeras of the brain—and to be, or not to be of equal weight in the scale, with Omnipotence? No, the Judge of all the earth will do right; the long suspended stroke will soon fall, in the plenitude of omnipotent power. Pestilence and war are standing in dread array against the feeble inhabitants of the earth. The storm may delay; but it will only break with accumulated strength, and sweep with a wider desolation. Who can look at the situation of Europe, without dread?—see the mighty march of pestilence, without dismay?

Europe is an encampment:—a vial poured on the "seat of the beast." What preparations for human slaughter! The treading of the wine press, the great battle of Armageddon, approaching! political earthquakes convulsing the continent! Alas, where is the government free from commotion, calm and undisturbed amidst the gathering storm—that is to survive the general wreck!

The 'signs of the times' are ominous of an eventful day. The harbingers appear, forerunners of the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the "year of the recompenses for the controversy of Zion." What time for idle speculations, unprofitable controversies, in the heat of battle? What time to war about names, or creeds, when the Lord's sword is to be bathed in heaven?

Now, reader, these things are just as sure to close the present administration, and precede the Millennium, as there is truth in the Bible. And what are we doing? Sleeping, slumbering, on the brink of ruin! How is Christendom, instead of restorations—instead of being wafted by the gentle gale of prosperity, into the Millennium, to become the theatre of *war, pestilence*, and *fire?* Reader! your personal safety demands your personal examination of these matters; they are not phantoms of the imagination. Trust to yourself and your God, "to the law and the testimony." If you trust to your blind guides, you are undone. "Enter into your closet, and shut the door, till the fierce indignation be overpast."

I have shown from facts, from reason, and analogy, that such things are coming, that they are at the door, that the tokens appear; wars and rumors are the heralds. Civil, as well as ecclesiastic convulsions, betoken the approaching storm. I will presently show, from the prophets, that these things are foretold in strong and pointed language; that no other consistent meaning can be attached to almost the whole of the alarming predictions in the Bible; that they all concentrate on the dissolution of the church, and not on nature at all; that a source of incalculable error is, the compounding of two great events together, the coming of Christ on the clouds of heaven, and the final judgment, or the close of time:—which events are entirely different; upon a close examination, the one before the other at least a thousand years.

There are many predictions that we have been applying to the final judgment which, when properly considered, cannot be thus applied, without involving difficulties, absurdities, or contradictions. It will not do to apply predictions to the final judgment because they are big with alarm, and terrible with destruction. The final judgment is rarely taken up, a subject slightly touched, in the Bible; but the judgment of the great *Whore*, the fall of antichrist, the close of the present administration, and relative events, are often taken up, under different figures and metaphors, and drawn in such lively colors, described in such emphatic language, that our "downy Doctors," our peace-predicting seers, for fear of disturbing their own repose, or that of the world, have applied them, *en masse*, to the final judgment, and have given themselves no further trouble on the subject.

The present system of things is well adapted to prevent investigation. Fitted out beforehand for reception, the pliant recipient has nothing to do but receive opinions shaped and moulded by some founder of a faction a century or two before he was born. Thus, as it was formerly, the fear of the Lord is taught by the precepts of men. Now-a-days, most of the articles of faith, or plans of getting to heaven, are self-devised—at least, of human invention—and to question the tradition of the Fathers, or strongly recommend the sacred oracles, as being entirely sufficient for faith and practice, will alike fix a suspicion of unsoundness in the faith. The Jewish church had its preconceived opinions so strongly fixed, their tradition so deeply riveted, that demonstration, opposed to their prejudice, was entirely impotent: they were "too strong for Omnipotence, they plucked down ruin." With Moses and the prophets in their hands, they rejected the very personage they were looking for:—with Moses, the prophets, and the Apostles, in our hands, Christ, in some way, is to be rejected again. How weak is reason, and the Bible too, when opposed to the tradition of the day! Could heaven propose any thing that would be received with universal approbation? The Jews, after crucifying the Lord's anointed, after shedding the blood of his saints, after filling up the measure of their iniquity, when ruin and destruction had encompassed them around, blindly infatuated, still looked for the special interposition of heaven: and they despaired not of this, until their city was was deluged in blood, and their temple enveloped in flames. Now is there not a dreadful parallel to be carried out on the Gentile church? Who can say there is not, and give a "thus says the Lord," for it? None: no, not one. Is not the same infatuation prevalent, the same unbelief, the same delusion, the same hope of being restored to primitive glory? Not a prominent feature in the one dispensation, without its relative in the other; they go with each other, in character and features, step by step.

We look at the Jewish church with astonishment, that they could so widely mistake the meaning of their prophets. The time is not far distant, when we will view with the same astonishment the fatal mistakes of the Gentile church relative to predictions as plain as the former, and no less important. Would it have been no safeguard to

the Jew, to have understood those predictions which related to his peace? Will it avail the Gentile nothing, to know and understand the alarming predictions contained in the Bible? The Book says, "Behold I come quickly: blessed is he that keeps the sayings of the prophecy of this book."

What is to be involved in this terrible metaphor, "And the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll"? When is the Lord's sword to be bathed in heaven?—"the wine press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God" to be trodden? When are the vials to be poured out? On whom are these things to have an accomplishment? When is the emphatic cry to be heard, "Babylon the Great is fallen! is fallen!"? When are the thrones to be cast down?—the martyrs raised again?—the new Jerusalem to come "down from God, out of heaven"? Are these questions of such trivial import that they may be answered some fifty years hence? Are they calculated to fill the mind with images of peace, or soothe into slumbers?—to operate as opiates or lullabies on the human race? Alas, what a situation the world is in! Is it to learn the meaning of the most alarming predictions in the Bible, in their dreadful accomplishment! Is it to be roused from the most profound slumber, by the cry, "Behold he comes!" Alas! how few, to all human appearance, will be ready to go in to the marriage supper of the Lamb! And just as sure as there is truth in the Bible, this marriage supper is to be consummated on earth; yet our blundering guides are transferring it to the worlds above!

Is the astonishing indifference manifested by our teachers respecting the meaning of this mysterious book, to be attributed to their palpable ignorance? or is it that they are following in close step the fatal path of their prototype? Which of them can come under the character, or claim the blessing of Heaven? God in his word is saying, "Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book;" and our teachers saying, We cannot understand the "*sayings*"—we must wait the accomplishment before we can understand. God and the Priests at difference!

Now, reader, examine what kind of commentators we are to have, if we are to find out the meaning in the dreadful events. God intends to be understood in the prophecies, or they would never have been given. Nor can I see any other point of safety, but in knowing and doing. Can we keep a saying or prophecy without understanding? or are we to make a merit of ignorance, and hazard the doing, when our weal or woe is inseparably connected—our seat at the marriage supper of the Lamb, or a dreadful "Depart ye" is to be the result?

It may be said, that the wise and learned have failed to understand the Revelations. God has addressed his word to common sense, and commonly brings to naught the wisdom of the wise. Nor will the wisdom of the wise ever decipher the mysterious book. The wisdom of the world has been searching where the meaning is not to be found. The Bible is its own expositor; and the surest, safest commentator on the Prophets, is the Prophets.

If common sense can understand the precepts of the Bible, why not its predictions too? Those interested in the one are interested in the other. Again, do genius and learning never err? What are the learned doing? Warring about trifles, bubbles, phantoms, their creeds, or formularies, when the Lord is about to sweep the earth with the besom of destruction. Must we (common sense people) sit down in the midst of alarm, and securely wait until the wise and learned have performed all their feats of Christian chivalry, their deeds of knight errantry, their mighty crusades, &c.? The prophecies, big with alarm and trouble—with destruction—are then to be taken up, and common sense relieved from her slow blundering researches, and improbable guesses.

Some of the learned have said, "The intimate and extensive acquaintance with history, requisite to a development of the predictions of Daniel and John, but few men have either leisure or means to acquire." Now if it be a fact that the poor had the gospel preached to them, and that the common people heard Christ gladly, for whom, think you, are the predictions intended? What class of men are, and have been, the most humble and faithful followers of the meek and lowly Saviour? To his followers, be they poor or ignorant, are the prophecies given.

God does not subject his people to the inconvenience of seeking some learned expositor, instead of searching the scripture. Why do we not hear the true meaning of Daniel and John from some of those who have the leisure and the means, whose dark book-case holds the terrible secret? What! no leisure to inquire into the meaning of the most alarming part of God's word—that which threatens the most tremendous calamity, which the present generation, probably, must see or feel? No means of information respecting the return of the Master, when he is to call his servants to a reckoning?

The events are at the door, and the learned sleeping or quarrelling about their favorite *isms*—warring about opinions, which, believed or disbelieved, make men neither better nor worse. Are we to ransack the pages of history for the meaning of God's word? Is the history of nations, Greece, Rome, or France, or the learning of the schools, to decipher the handwriting? What reliance are we to place on the wisdom of the wise? Are they agreed? Does demonstration attend their footsteps, or are their absurdities any better than the absurdities of common sense? Some of the learned will tell us that a part of the Apocalypse related to the Huns, Goths, or Vandals, (why not to the Pottawatamies?) to a time remarkable for thunder and hail! Forsooth, was the thunder and hail any better at that time than that which we have now-a-days? Another will tell us the heathen gods, goddesses, temples, and their precincts, were alluded to in another place; that the treading of the winepress had its accomplishment at the destruction of Jerusalem! which is equal to saying, a prophecy had its accomplishment twenty-five or thirty years before it was made! Others will apply scripture prophecy to the French Revolution—to the Spanish Armada! Those who would saddle

France with all the antichristian epithets, and plagues too, have been bad neighbors, and have forgotten that no scripture prophecy is of a private interpretation.

Now is it not high time the learned were trying some other expedient—seeking some other road to the knowledge of Daniel and John—inquiring at the Prophets the meaning of the Prophets?

There is another consideration which I would offer some of our modern Millennium-makers, and those who are dreaming about a gradual Millennium. Say the Millennium is to last a thousand years, who will know when it begun, when to begin its date, when it is to end, or that it is in existence, or any thing about it? Is the universal reign of Christ a matter of such ordinary importance that we are to be left without any data to go by—left to guess—to mere conjecture respecting its commencement? When it is fairly proved that we can arrive at no certainty respecting the introduction of this important event, this long promised time, this coronation of the King of kings—I will prove that it will never be.

Does Heaven leave matters of much importance, much interest, much prophecy, in *doubt*—fulfilled in an obscure corner, without proof, without demonstration, no visible footsteps of Omnipotence?

God has pledged himself that the heathen shall be given to his Son for an inheritance—the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession—that he shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied—of his kingdom there shall be no end—that righteousness shall cover the earth as the waters do the channel of the sea—that the sword shall be beaten into a ploughshare, and the spear into a pruning hook—that the nations shall learn war no more—that every one shall sit down under his vine and fig tree—that none shall have need to teach his neighbor, saying, Know the Lord; all shall know him, from the least to the greatest—that all people, nations, and languages should serve him, &c. Are the promises to be fulfilled in a corner—these pledges redeemed without producing a new era—without being visible to the universe?

Looking at the face of things as they stand presented to human calculation, what but the most stupendous miracle can consummate what God in his word stands pledged to perform? A dark cloud of war is rising—has risen—is stretched across the political horizon of almost every nation in Christendom—war inevitable—pestilence standing in dreadful array against the human family, slaying its millions—religious discord no less prevalent, forever going the length of its chain. Who will say the four winds are not let loose to hurt the earth? Who may say the unclean spirits, like frogs, have not gone forth to deceive the nations?

Looking at the face of things as they now appear, and the promises respecting the glories of Christ's universal reign, what else but the strong arm of Omnipotence, the most stupendous miracle, will bring about that glorious event? Is the universal reign of Christ to be ushered in with less parade than his birth, the reign of his humility, the era of his crucifixion and suffering? Is he to rule the nations

with a rod of iron? ("As the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to pieces,") and they not be sensible of it? Now, if the universal reign of Christ is to produce a new era, (and I defy proof to the contrary,) what mighty event is to be which will fix its imposing stamp on the annals of time—with its magnitude eclipse the most memorable events on earth—when the epochs of nations and empires will be lost in its mighty blaze of glory—when the King of Kings shall return to his heritage on earth, clad in the ensigns of his royalty, with his retinue of saints and martyred followers?

What a scene rushes on my imagination! How am I rapt, overwhelmed with anticipation! Shall I—shall these eyes "see him for myself, and not for another?" Reader, 'tis not fiction—the scene is touched by the finger of God—the picture is sketched by unerring Truth. His forerunners appear—the tokens of his coming are seen. Ye who look for him the "second time, lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh"—ere it be long his banner will be seen displayed across heaven's vast expanse—his escort, a host from heaven, "ten thousand times ten thousand." At midnight, when men are sunk in deep repose, or revelling and rejoicing in success of human slaughter, the world mad with discord, and reeking with blood—at midnight, sudden "as the lightning that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, and shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of Man be in his day." And while this display of heaven's splendor approaches the astonished world, or stands conspicuous within our hemisphere, the world, the work of his hands, will perform a revolution on its axis and exhibit to every being on its surface the King of kings and Lord of lords. "Every eye shall see him." "Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus."

I will next take up the prophecies, and support these views by the "law and the testimony."

[*To be continued.*]

A New Mode of Warfare,

Recommended by Mr. R. Powell, *in the New York Baptist Register and* Eli Ball, *of the Religious Herald, Va.*

Extract from the "Baptist Register" of November 2.

"Before I close I have a word more to say in behalf of the north-easterly part of Ohio. This is an important field: very few ministers are found in this section; our churches are mostly dispersed and broken by Campbell's pestilential sentiments, which, like the cholera, burst the bands of society. But I believe these sentiments are on the wane. I was earnestly solicited by the different denominations to settle in that region, and lift a standard against these dangerous errors. It was believed that a church of 100 members might be gathered in the vicinity of Aurora, in a short time, by a prudent devoted minister. Had I not already fixed on a location, I should doubtless have concluded to enter this field. I have just received a letter from Col. John E. Jackson, of Aurora, requesting me to come and settle at Auburn, where

favorable offers are made. I mention this, hoping that some brother in the ministry, possessing the hardihood of a good soldier, and is willing to enter a field which demands unremitting activity, prudence, and devotion, may improve this notice, and bend his course that way. But whoever successfully enters that field, must fight Campbellism *by letting it alone*, especially in public discourses. The victory must be achieved by the simplicity of the gospel both in word and deed.

"Yours in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,

R. POWELL."

Extract from the "Religious Herald," of February S.

"We agree with our brother B. in the belief that a middle course might be devised, which should avoid Antinomianism on the one hand and Campbellism on the other. Both of these extremes have been fruitful sources of evil to our churches, and both ought to be carefully avoided. The surest way to defeat the latter is to hold no controversy with its author or his adherents—to take no notice of him or his work, or the communications of his friends. They have grown and prospered by controversy—it has excited an interest and attention to his productions, which their own merits would never have gained for them. It ought to be the first object of our churches to induce his followers to withdraw peaceably from our churches, and then leave them to enjoy their opinions unmolested."

EDITOR'S REMARKS

On the above Bulletins of the Retreating Army.

"*Fight Campbellism by letting it alone*"! "*with the hardihood of a good soldier*"! "*with unremitting activity, prudence, and devotion*"!!! It requires great hardihood, valor, courage, unremitting activity, to fight an enemy in this new mode of warfare—*by letting the enemy alone!* These gentlemen are for fighting; and, of course, fighting an enemy; for, good-natured souls! they would not fight their friends: but, really, their supposed enemies have reason to admire their magnanimity no less than their heroism—their tender mercy no less than their generalship. When I fall into the hands of an enemy, may he be one of this new school of tactics, who will only molest me *by letting me alone!*

This is not, however, the mode prescribed by the great Captain General of the Army of Martyrs, nor his Field Marshals—the Apostles. *Fight Satan by letting him alone*, was no aphorism of that gallant band of soldiers who unsheathed the sword of the Spirit and put to flight the armies of the aliens. These ancient heroes needed all the armor of God; but had they lived in our days, under this new system, invented by these good soldiers of distinguished "*hardihood*," they could have saved many a scar, and many a rebuff, and many a wound, *by turning their backs, and seeking victory by their heels!*

He that from danger runs away,
May chance to fight another day;
But he that's in the battle slain,
Can never hope to fight again.

"*By letting it alone!*" Stop, says Mr. Powell, I do not mean to let it alone altogether; but only when any of these heretics are *present.*

"Let it alone in all *public* discourses;" but at private firesides we mean to use broadsides, in the presence of *women and children*, when our enemies are out of the hearing of the thunder of our cannon. Then I would say, "Possess the hardihood of good soldiers, enter the field with unremitting activity, *prudence*, and devotion" to your offices. Thank you, Mr. Powell, for this explanation! We understood your *gallantry* long ago; but thought you would never have had the candor to acknowledge it!

But to drop your figurative, and to come to the literal of your chivalrous address to the officers of your army. I cannot but acknowledge, both to you and your associate at the South, the *Reverend Eli Ball*, who venerates that saying of PAUL, "How can two walk together unless they are agreed"! I say, I cannot but acknowledge the honor you have done us *heretics*, by giving orders to your officers to let us alone now that we are "on the wane"! Having emptied your magazines of slander, detraction, and abuse—having hurled your anathemas, flaming from the Vatican, and brought us to our knees, you now discover it to be *prudence* to let us alone! Would that you had learned this lesson sooner, and we should have been *waxing* instead of *waning!* Well, 'tis generous not to exult over a fallen enemy, and to say to the conquering legions, "Let him alone!" But still we cannot forget your fine figures. Let us make another effort.

Messrs. Ball & Co. and Messrs. Powell & Co. have, raillery apart, come to a prudent conclusion. They have seen that their former course has reverted on their own heads, and given such a reaction to public opinion as bids fair to overwhelm them in their own entrenchments. But this is just the very counsel which every Gamaliel would have long ago given; and this was all the boon we asked—"*Let us alone!*" Nullify your decrees, your denunciations, your anathemas, and interdict your former reproaches, and all divisions will cease, all strifes will terminate, and we shall not say one word about you; your names, if you please, shall neither be pronounced nor written. You, gentlemen, and your followers, or your friends (if you please) are the sole cause of all discord and division. We would never exclude from the kingdom man or woman, but for immorality or profanity—for disobedience or rebellion—for contempt or treason—not for mere opinions, were they even midway between Antinomianism and C———m.

You, gentlemen, have now conceded all we ask. You have honored us more than we ever expected. You now tell us, in language intelligible to all, that you cannot hold your ground with us in the field of investigation, scripture argument, and rational controversy. You have candidly avowed that it was an error in you at first to attempt this—that your prudence, in that best of schools, the school of experience, has convinced you that by controversy we must "grow and prosper," as by it we "have grown and prospered." This places in a singular attitude your representation about our *waning*. Why, gentlemen, should you propose to abandon a course which caused us

to *wane*? Why desert the ground on which you conquered? Why throw away the weapons by which you have vanquished us? Have you considered the import of this concession, or has the truth for once, in defiance of your policy, gained an utterance and been published by your own pens?

True, indeed, you can never gain by discussion. But by creeping into houses you may either lead captive, or hold captive, silly, thoughtless women and children, and men as silly as they. You can never prove a proposition nor support a tradition, which any man, who knows how to turn the leaves of a Bible, will impugn. But is it not singular that you should publish to the world that your cause was in danger, if you would continue the controversy? Was ever truth placed in this dilemma before? In the days of the Prophets, in the days of the Messiah, in the days of the Reformation, it grew and prospered by controversy and discussion; and how comes it now that it courts the twilight, and prefers the secret interview to public discussion!

After this avowal, if you will honestly act upon your own counsels, I assure you we will not molest you; provided, however, you will retrace your steps, and nullify as well as stultify your former proceedings. But we want nullification as well as stultification in regard to the past, before we can hold out the olive branch. But allow me to correct one error into which you seem to have fallen. You seem to think, or, at least, would have others to think, that we delight in controversy for its own sake. Not so: If you could read the history of the last ten years, sketched by a faithful hand, you would see that we have acted upon the defensive, and not upon the offensive. We avoided all cause of divisions and anathemas, and were willing to bear and forbear, and to teach you the way of the Lord more perfectly. But your pride would not suffer you to unteach what you have taught, and to bow in all homage to the Apostles.

Now you talk about reform, and Mr. Ball in the Herald lying before me, of the 8th February, calls upon the Baptists to reform, and makes his specifications with such generality as to cover almost our whole area. What is the meaning of this? Is it to blind the eyes of those under his tutelage, or for the purpose of stifling the convictions of those who are half awakened to a sense of their condition? It will not do, gentlemen. Such double and deceitful conduct will soon expose you to the derision of many who may now honor you with their suffrage. But come it will, as sure as the truth was told by the Apostles—the day will come, when shame and confusion will cover you, unless you repent and bring forth fruits worthy of reformation. When you cease to vituperate and slander our humble efforts to awaken the sleeping virgins to a just view of their condition, we shall begin to think that you mean to be as good as your word; but till then, while you let us alone in *argument*, and load us with slanders, we shall regard you as knavish, imbecile, and self-condemned.

Nota Bene.—A middle party is now proposed in Virginia. They are to steer right in the midst of the channel between the two *C isms*.

Let them try it; but let none of our brethren be lured by this false flag. It is holding out a bait to some, and a snare to others. Mr. Broaddus, Mr. Ball, and even Mr. Kerr, I presume, are to be the leaders of this semi, demi, midmay reformation. One thing I would say to these "let-us-alone"-warriors, if they will pretermit their opposition for one year, we will promise to fill our pages with a variety of matter more in accordance with our own feelings; and which we would humbly hope would be more edifying and salutary to our readers than the exposition of the schemes, managements, decrees, and councils of our prejudiced and uncandid opponents.

EDITOR.

Address to the Virginia Baptists.

PART III.

I NOW hasten to redeem my pledge. I have said that *no greater tyranny is known under this government than was exercised by the last Dover Association;* and now proceed to state, illustrate, and prove it.

1. That the case may be fairly stated, we shall give from an authority which the authors of the decree of excision will not question, *the defined powers of that Association.* I quote from that "Summary of Church Discipline drawn up by the direction of the Dover Association, by a committee, consisting of Messrs. Semple, Broaddus, Bryce, Hyde, and Roper, appointed for that purpose, and recommended by the Association as a help to the churches; printed in Richmond, 18 4." On page 8th the following is found as a summary of the rights of each church or congregation:—

"7. All regular gospel churches have, each of them respectively, full power and authority to transact their own affairs, independent of any other church or churches: such as to choose their own officers, receive members, exercise discipline among themselves, exclude disorderly members; and, in general, to do every thing that concerns them as a distinct religious body or society. Matt. xviii. 17. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, &c. 2 Thess. iii. 14. Acts i. 15—23, and vi. 3, and xv. 4."

Such are the declared powers, rights, and immunities of a Virginia Baptist congregation in the year 1824, by the largest Association in America. Now we shall hear the defined and constitutional powers of that Association:—

"1. An Association consists of delegates or messengers from the different churches, which have agreed to associate together, at stated times, for the purpose of uniting their deliberations and counsels, in order to promote their own spiritual interest and the good of the common cause.

"2. An Association is considered by us merely in the light of an *advisory council*: for as, according to our views, the independence of churches, and their consequent right of self-government, are clearly established in the New Testament, no authority is vested in an Association to enforce their decisions on the churches; nor can they inflict any other penalty on a church than that of exclusion from their body, *as an Association.*"

We shall now place along side of these classified and well defined powers of the Association, the DECREE, as recorded in the Religious Herald of the 19th October, 1832: -

"We, therefore, the assembled ministers and delegates of the Dover Association, after much prayerful deliberation, do hereby affectionately recommend to the churches in our connexion, to separate from their communion all such persons as are promoting controversy and discord, under the specious name of "Reformers." That the line of distinction may be clearly drawn, so that all who are concerned may understand it, we feel it our duty to declare, that, whereas Peter Ainsley, John Du Val, Matthew W. Webber, Thos. M. Henley, John Richards, and Dudley Atkinson, ministers within the bounds of this Association, have voluntarily assumed the name of "Reformers," in its party application, by attending a meeting publicly advertised for that party; and by communing with, and otherwise promoting the views of the members of that party who have been separated from the fellowship and communion of Regular Baptist Churches—

"*Resolved*, That this Association cannot consistently and conscientiously receive them, nor any other ministers maintaining their views, as members of their body: nor can they in future act in concert with delegates from any church or churches that may encourage or countenance their ministrations."

Now, with these documents before us, of unquestionable authority with our opponents, let us calmly examine this decree. It is declared that the churches have full power and authority to transact their own affairs, *to choose their own officers*, and that "the Association has no authority to enforce their decisions on the churches;" yet, in the face of these solemn declarations, the Dover Association did positively decree that it cannot in future act in concert with the delegates from any church that *may choose for its officer*, "or encourage or countenance the ministrations of Peter Ainsley, John Du Val, Matthew W. Webber, Thomas M. Henley, John Richards, and Dudley Atkinson." Is not this in direct contravention of the independence of every church in the Association, and their declared right "to choose their own officers, receive members, exercise discipline among themselves, and to do every thing that concerns them as a distinct religious body or society"? The Association says they must not choose any one of these six ministers, else they will have no fellowship with them; telling them at the same time, that each church has "full power and authority to transact its own business, choose its own officers, and that the Association has no authority to enforce its decisions on the churches." If this be not insolence, intolerance, and usurpation, will some of the majority give us a definition of these words?

It may be alleged that in the Constitution of the Association there is a power assumed of excluding a *church* from the body when she ceases to be in favor with the Association: but this is defined to be an exclusion from the body only, *as an Association*. She stands then as an unassociated church, or as she was before she entered the Association. This is fairly indicated in the verbiage of the instrument; but I presume it means more than it says: for it would have been too gross and perceptible to have assumed any power over the churches just in the next period after declaring that the Association disclaimed any such power.

But the Dover Association has not only transcended the letter and spirit of her charter, and of the charter of the churches, in an attempt to exercise authority over these churches; but she has done more: she has presumed to exercise a species of papistical authority over

those individuals called "ministers of the gospel." She, as far as in her lies, or as far as there is authority in her ordinance, has nullified not only the christian character of these churches, but of those ministers also. Now by what chartered or delegated authority does the Dover Association pronounce sentence of heresy against these ministers? When was she constituted a religious Court of Oyer and Terminer, with power to summon witnesses, examine testimony, to expound law, and pronounce sentence upon all the ministers living within her bounds? Did these six ministers acknowledge such a right in the Association, or in a bare majority of the ministers of that Association? Was there such a written agreement, or was there such a *bona fide* understanding in the bond of union? If there is no such delegated power, it must have been assumed; and such assumptions are of the very essence of usurpation and tyranny. Certain it is, that there is no such power granted in any printed document which we have seen: nor is it, in our judgment, at all admissible upon the expressed views of English or American Baptists. I do not think that the Baptists of Virginia, who have been so justly celebrated for their republican principles and behavior, could or would ever, intentionally at least, delegate such authority to any set of men. How could they? Do they not declare that legislative, judiciary, and executive powers shall not at one and the same time be reposed in one and the same individual or association of individuals? And are men's religious character, rights, and privileges to be less guarded than their political interests? A Baptist Association, acting as did the late Dover Association, I hold to be a solecism in both political and ecclesiastic law and usage; one of the most dangerous establishments which ever existed under the name of a Court of Christ. An advisory council with power to deprive a person of both religious and moral character, without any responsibility, and allowed to exercise all sorts of powers at one and the same session!

What is dearer to a man than his character—than his religious and moral character? And is that which is dearer than life itself to be committed to a self-created court, responsible to no tribunal under heaven! But it will be asked, Is this the fact in the case before us? I unequivocally answer, to the best of my judgment, in the affirmative.

Reader, examine the aforesaid decree. Is not the following narrative the unvarnished state of the case? Six "ministers of the gospel," as the Dover Association once called them, of irreproachable religious and moral character, and more than as many churches, are condemned and excommunicated for not only holding, but inculcating "doctrines not according to godliness," "disorganizing and DEMORALIZING in their tendency;" and do they not add, "Therefore, ought to be resisted and disavowed by all the lovers of truth and sound piety."* Yes, *demoralizing!* Nor do they say that this is the speculative opinion of the Association; but that they have actually discovered this to be their *practical* influence upon the churches. Their

*Preamble to the Decree—Religious Herald, Oct. 19, 1832.

words are, "We waited long to witness their practical influence upon the churches and society in general." Now, is it a very small matter that six ministers of the gospel be thus held up to public scorn, as demoralizers and disorganizers, inculcating principles whose tendency has been witnessed to demoralize society! principles which, from actual observation of the Association, have been tested, not by theoretic abstractions, but by their practical results, to be disorganizing, demoralizing, and ungodly! I ask the Virginia Baptists, the sons of the fathers of American liberty, the advocates of the trial by jury, of the *habeas corpus*, of an independent judiciary, of placing legislative, judiciary, and executive powers in different hands; is it republican, is it American, is it safe (to say nothing of the Bible) that such a power should be placed in the hands of any single representative body—of any court, or tribunal of judgment, unguarded by any court of appeal, any superior or controlling, independent tribunal, to which the aggrieved may appeal?

If we are to have courts for trying such causes, I plead for the Presbyterian or Episcopalian, with all their defects. Under these governments, a minister is not to be arraigned, tried, and condemned, at one session, by one and the same body,—acting the treble part of witness, judge, and jury,—without the hope of a rehearing.

But the worst is yet to be told. For admitting that the constitution had given to a part of this Association, either by construction or explicitly, the power of arraigning, trying, and condemning individuals for heresy, ought not the accused to have at least Pagan courtesy extended to them? ought they not to be permitted to be present, in person or by their attorney, and have a hearing on the indictment, before sentence was pronounced against them? And was this the case in the late proceedings of said Association? The accused were not invited, most of them absent, no testimony heard; and even the forms of justice were dispensed with. In all other courts, the allegata must be proved, testimony adduced, the law must be applied, and that before an independent tribunal; but these unfortunate brethren were before-written to condemnation. The sentence was concocted and written in Richmond before the Council sat; and all that was necessary, was to take the vote, and unchristianize the ministers and the churches.

Virginia Baptists, are you prepared for this? Is this your love of liberty, of law, of justice, of religious freedom? I know it is not. But you have said, practically said, that your preachers cannot err; you are willing they should act for you. They are all good men, sound in faith, and therefore in practice can do no wrong. What stronger evidence have they given of love to the Saviour, of devotion to his will, of honesty in their profession, than the persons whom they have excommunicated? What greater self-denial, what greater attachment to truth, what greater sacrifices have they made for conscience sake, than those brethren from whom they have taken their good name as far as it was in their keeping? Compare them in every point, and see whether the strong party are more intelligent and vir-

tuous than the weak—whether the excommunicators, as far as you can judge, stand higher in the estimation of God and man than the excommunicated?

Do you think that the Judge of all will applaud you for thus treating his followers? will he thank you for thus beating your fellow-servants in his absence? I beseech you to ponder well your doings, and retrace your steps; for if there be any action of your lives, more than any other, that will be more strictly scrutinized, it is that of assuming the judgment seat, and saying to your brethren, Depart, you, from our presence. And, recollect, as long as you sustain the persons which thus usurped these high prerogatives, you are their accessories, and as censurable as they.

EDITOR.

The Church of God.

Mr. Butterworth has given us a short, but just description of the church of God in her present militant state. He says, "It is a particular congregation of BELIEVERS IN CHRIST, united together IN THE ORDER OF THE GOSPEL." If this be a correct view of the character of the church of God, then all who are united together upon any other principle than as *believers in Christ*, cannot have any right to be called *the church of God*. This I presume no man of common sense will deny Taking this for granted, we shall in a few words undertake to show what it is to be a believer in Christ, and to be united together in the order of the gospel.

To be *a believer in Christ* is to receive with implicit confidence the testimony he has given us of himself, and to yield our souls, bodies, and spirits to his commands. No man can be said to be *in Christ*, who refuses to enter into the reign of his favor.

In the ancient gospel men were taught to know that "so many as were immersed into Jesus Christ, were immersed into his death; therefore, they were BURIED with him by baptism into death; that, like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life:" "for as many as have been immersed into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one IN CHRIST JESUS." *This is the testimony of the Holy Spirit.*

To be united together IN THE ORDER OF THE GOSPEL, surely means that the examples of the primitive disciples and the precepts of the gospel should *alone* be the bond of union among such as are BELIEVERS IN CHRIST. If any thing short of this, or more was intended, it could not be "*the order of the gospel*," as every man of common sense must admit.

Thus we find to be a BELIEVER IN CHRIST, is to receive and give credence to the testimony which God has given of him, and to be

immersed into his name, in obedience to his command. And to be united together *in the order of the gospel*, is to make the gospel the rule of our conduct and bond of our union. So says common sense.

But the question has arisen, 'Has not the church a right to change the rites somewhat?' We answer, The founders of the orthodox sects, one and all, admit immersion or baptism into the name of Jesus was essentially necessary to our being in him; but "*the church did grant liberty to herself, since the beginning, to change the rites somewhat, excepting the substance.*"

Permit me to adopt the homely language of Procopius, who laughed at the *bulls* of the Popes of his day. At a *council* one of the orators called him a heretic. He exclaimed, "That countryman of ours insults us by calling us heretics." The Cardinal said, "he had heard that they taught that the fraternities of the Monks were the invention of the devil, which was an offence to Christian ears." "Very true," replied the General, "for if neither the Patriarchs, nor Moses, nor the Prophets, nor Christ, nor the Apostles appointed monkery, who does not see that the devil was the author of it?" Let this reasoning be applied to those who say, "The church did grant liberty, or has taken liberty to herself, somewhat to depart from the order of the gospel," and we shall find the author.

There does exist among the most evangelical sect (I mean the Baptist) one of the most heretical and destructive principles to the church of God that is practised at this day. It is this· they have evidently dethroned Jesus Christ and his Apostles in the government of the church. Let me prove this. "*Government* is not a trade, which any man or body of men have a right to set up and exercise for their own emolument or interest, but is altogether a *trust* in right of those by whom the trust is delegated, and by whom it is also resumable. It has itself no *rights*—THEY ARE ALL DUTIES. All powers exercised over a church must have some beginning. They must be either DELEGATED OR ASSUMED. There are no other sources. ALL DELEGATED POWER IS A TRUST, and ALL ASSUMED POWER IS USURPATION."

"*Every delegated authority implies a trust*; responsibility follows as the shadow does the substance. But where there is no responsibility, authority is no longer a trust, but *an act of usurpation.* And EVERY ACT OF USURPATION is either AN ACT OF TREASON or AN ACT OF WARFARE."——*Tucker's Blackstone, vol.* 1.

Paul said, "For though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to boast of: for necessity is laid upon me: yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel. For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward; but if against my will, a dispensation of the gospel is committed to me, what is my reward then? Verily, that when I preach the gospel I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that *I abuse not my power in the gospel.*" "Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joys: for by faith you stand."

I now call upon Messrs. Kerr, Ball, Jeter, Montague, Broaddus, Micou, Taylor, Hill, and E. Montague, with all those who supported

their preamble and resolution, to point out to us the text of Scripture wherein they are *delegated in an association* to arraign and condemn men, *without notice and while absent*, who are willing to obey every precept of the gospel and follow the examples of the primitive disciples, as recorded in the New Testament; or even show from the constitution of their Association whether they were ever delegated with power to exclude the churches for exercising their own rights or privileges as independent bodies. If they cannot produce their power of attorney from our King for having so shamefully treated us, we call upon them either to revoke their unrighteous decree, or publicly acknowledge they were unauthorized so to do. If they do not, every man possessed of discernment must see they have *assumed* this power, and are *usurpers* of our privileges granted us by our King; and this *act of usurpation* is to demonstration TREASON or WAR against him.

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

NOTES

On reading Semple's History of the Baptists.

"WHEN the NEW LIGHT STIR broke out, under Whitefield's preaching, the Parish clergy not only refused the preachers of this *new light* the use of their meeting houses, but actually procured the passage of a law to confine all preachers to their own parishes." p. 1. *Query*—Who now, in Virginia, most resemble these parish clergy in refusing meeting houses?

"In the county of Spottsylvania, occurred the first instance of imprisonment. On the 4th of June, 1768, John Waller, Lewis Craig, James Childs, &c. were seized by the Sheriff for disturbing the peace of the churches, (society,) and after trial were sent to jail: yet," says Mr. Semple, "in very few sections in Virginia did the Baptist cause appear more formidable to its enemies, than in this same county of Spottsylvania; and, [says he] we may add, so it is at this day." What a pity that A. W. Clopton, J. Kerr, and W. Montague, with their brethren of the late Committee in Spottsylvania, had not read the 16th and 17th pages of Semple's History, before their late proceedings against the Reformers. Will not their tyranny react, in Spottsylvania, as in days of yore?

"No county ever extended its opposition and persecution to the Baptists farther than Chesterfield; and yet, in few counties have Baptist principles prevailed more extensively than in Chesterfield." p. 17. Why then not hear the testimony of two witnesses, and learn moderation?

"When any Baptist fell into any improper conduct, it was always exaggerated to the utmost extent." p. 19. Is there nothing like this, now-a-days, from the Baptists to any unworthy reformer?

Their opposers said, "that they were all in peace and friendship before the coming of the Baptists, but now their houses and neighborhoods were filled with religious disputes." p. 21. Concerning whom did the late Dover Association reiterate this charge?

"No person was allowed to dispose of, or publish any books or pamphlets containing the tenets of their [Quaker's] religion." p. 30. What is the difference between this and the Baptists' now trying to prohibit the reading of the Millennial Harbinger?

EDITOR.

More Proscription.

FREDERICKSBURG, Va. February 5, 1833.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE drawn out a hasty sketch of the difficulties in the Fredericksburg church, from their commencement up to the doings of the last great council. But although it is a mere outline, without comment, it occupies more space, and is, in my judgment, so uninteresting, that if the readers of the Harbinger could be entertained with it, I should myself feel unwilling that so much space should be taken up to the exclusion of other matter of more importance. I purpose, however, in this to say something of the proceedings of the council which met this place, and which, in a very summary way, settled the previously existing difficulties; and if you think you would like to see what has been set down in regard to former proceedings, it shall be forwarded to you. It may, however, be necessary to premise that a division had taken place previous to the meeting of the council; that a party had, in a most disorderly manner, separated themselves from the church, and retired to the court house, in which they met from time to time.

On the Friday before the third Lord's day in January, the council met at the house of Mr. James Williams, organized themselves, prepared and arranged matters; and after doing this, adjourned by invitation to the meeting-house. This council consisted of the following Elders, viz.—P. Montague, A. W. Clopton, L. Battaille, C. George, A. H. Bennett, Spilby Woodfork, and John Kerr. Twenty were invited, but the above named seven only attended. A committee, consisting of Elder G. F. Adams, William Harvey, and myself, had been appointed, on the part of the church, to invite them to sit in the meeting-house, and lay before them any evidence they might deem proper.

When the meeting was properly organized, I arose and requested to be informed what object they had in view—in one word, what they thought of themselves. I was given to understand that they were invited here by that part of the church which had separated from the church, to say (after having heard all the evidence in the case) whether they were worthy of the confidence of the Christian community—not for the purpose of expressing any opinion, or passing any censure on either party.

We then said, we wished it distinctly understood that we did not look upon the council as possessing any authority over us, nor were we willing to grant them any, for one or two reasons:—We had no voice in choosing them as a council, and that they had, or some of them had made up their minds in regard to our Christian character. But added at the same time, that we were willing, if we could have an equal choice, to leave the settlement of the difficulties to brethren. But this was not assented to. They then produced charges, and read them before the congregation, against brothers G. F. Adams, A. Leitch, and myself, copies of which charges were requested and promised to be furnished. Brothers Adams and Leitch were furnished accordingly; but in consequence of their understanding me to say that I did not wish a copy, one was not handed me. The same evening, however, I made application for a copy to brother C. George, which he recollects. After reading the charges, the council adjourned, to meet next day (Saturday) at 10 o'clock, at which time we were to be permitted to answer for ourselves.

The next day, met according to adjournment. As soon as the meeting was opened it was announced that they were ready to hear the answers to the charges. I arose and said, as I had not been furnished with a copy of the charges, would they permit me now to reply? But they refused to hear only by a written communication. They said, however, that I could, as the charges were the same, get the one furnished brother L. and reply before their secret session. I replied that they had charged me openly before the congregation, and thought it but justice that I should reply before the congregation to the charges. But I was not to be heard. I determined, however, the first opportunity that offered to do so. Brother Adams then arose and ably refuted all the slander and charges brought against him; and so also did brother Leitch.

As soon as they adjourned I borrowed of brother L. the paper containing the charges against him, and in the short time allowed me between the adjournment and their secret session, made an answer, and read it before them. But the whole of this business was a party concern. They came to a decision on Saturday night; but although applied to to know the result, they would not divulge it, saying that they had pledged themselves to one another not to make it known until after preaching on Monday. Preaching on Lord's day by Kerr, Clopton, and George. On Monday morning, instead of meeting and making known the decision, they had a long preachment; after which brother A. arose and said that the council had come to a decision, and although he had not heard it in detail, yet the substance had been made known to him; and although it was not altogether such as he could wish, and although in the outset he had denied any power to the council, he was now willing to submit to their better wisdom.

After him, brother Kerr got up and prefaced the decision of the council by an attack on C—ism and Alexander Campbell, stating that he had known you intimately for eight years; he had taken you to his bosom; he had given you his pulpit; in fine, he had done every thing to reclaim you. He had read your Christian Baptist and Millennial Harbinger from beginning to ending; that you were a wandering star, a floating luminary, (of some brilliancy he confessed,) but no fixed place; that he must be a wicked man that would read your writings, and many other things to your prejudice.

He then read the decision, and O how different from what they set out upon! I can only give you the substance; for although promised a copy, like other of their promises, they did not fulfil it. They said, after hearing all the evidence from both sides, [not a fact,] they pronounced the part that had separated the Baptist church of Fredericksburg, and that the principles of C——ism were in the other party; that we had introduced innovations into the church; that the church was now willing to forgive all and open its bosom to all who would return, and that they were coming down for the purpose of effecting a union.

After he had got through with his attempt to enlist the feelings of the brethren and the congregation against us, I arose (much to their disappointment, it being now 3 o'clock, the congregation having been detained from 10 to this hour,) and said that, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which I labored, I believed the congregation were disposed to do me more justice than the council. In the course of my remarks I challenged Kerr, or any other man then present, to produce one instance of innovation which had been introduced by us, or any view or sentiment we held that was not in accordance with the oracles of divine truth. I also took occasion to say that we had been charged in the Religious Herald with sentiments that we positively denied, ("that faith was a mere assent of the mind, and denying the operation of the Holy Spirit,") and then gave my views of faith and the work of the Spirit. I called upon the oracle of the council, or any other person present, to produce a passage, (for in all my searching after truth I had never been able to find one,) that said that it was necessary for the Spirit of God to operate on the human heart in order to produce faith. I have been told that at this part

of my address the reverend gentlemen shook their heads; but not one could answer to this request; indeed they seemed determined to continue as they had commenced—namely, to condemn without proof.

When brother Kerr was traducing your character, I could have wished that you could have walked up the aisle of the meeting house. I did say for you, that you could do more justice in defending your own character than I had ability to do for you; and that it was no mark of a generous heart, or noble mind, to attack and condemn any man without a hearing. After witnessing all their proceedings, I came to the conclusion that I had never seen so much management and so little Christian dignity of character in any council that I had ever seen.

After brother Leitch had also replied, Kerr and Clopton came down. The former charged brother L. and myself with making angry speeches. He then invited all those who had not embraced or favored your sentiments now to come forward; that the brethren were willing to forgive and open their bosoms to take them back to their fellowship. Three resolutions were read: one declaring non-fellowship with you, one declaring non-fellowship with all who hold you in fellowship, and another that they would not invite into their pulpit any who held your sentiments, &c. Now, sir, they are in one of two dilemmas: they are either constituted on a confession of faith that is not believed by more than one half, or upon a resolution declaring non-fellowship with you. But I must stop, and tell you something of more importance.

On the next Wednesday evening we constituted a church upon the statutes and laws of *Christ and his Apostles*, as laid down in the *New Testament*. On last Lord's day this little band met and broke bread, &c. Our number amounts to 15—9 male and 6 female members. We have appointed a committee to solicit subscriptions for building a meeting-house. In this undertaking every exertion is used; but we are poor, and every thing calculated to prejudice the public mind is circulated to our disdavantage. We do not aim at a fine house—all we want is a plain substantial building—one than will hold a congregation when visited by strange brethren who labor in the word and doctrine. Is not Fredericksburg an important point? and will not our brethren at a distance, whom the Lord has prospered, aid us? I feel as if I never felt poverty more sensibly than I do. We have already subscribed 900 dollars. It is thought that if we can get $2500, as large a house as the Baptist meeting-house in this place can be built. We hope to be visited by all who feel an interest in the progress of reformation who can come; and we hope also to share in the prayers and sympathies of all our dear brethren, that we may be able to endure all the persecution and reproaches that are heaped upon us for the truth's sake.

May the Lord bless you and your exertions in behalf of the ancient order of things, is the prayer of yours in the Lord.

R. B. FIFE.

Everlasting Gospel.

No. II.

THE angel of this everlasting gospel announces the good news that the suffering days of Christians are numbered—that *the hour of judgment has come*—that the Lord is about to recompense his enemies, and to commence his reign over all the kingdoms of the world. We closed our first essay on this subject, saying that not one of the kingdoms of this world had become a Christian kingdom—no kingdom of this world has yet become a kingdom of Jesus Christ. Let us now examine this assertion with all attention.

Christians there are in many of the kingdoms of this world. In all the American states, in all the European kingdoms, in some of the Asiatic and African nations; but not one of these states, nations, or tribes, *as such*, is a kingdom of Jesus Christ: for one of the very plainest reasons in the world—not one of them is governed in person by Jesus Christ; not one of them acknowledges him as its King and administers his laws. Not one of them became a kingdom by adopting his constitution, and vowing allegiance to him as Governor in all things.

Says one well versed in the policies of nations, and in the laws of Christian ethics, and all the writings of the Christian teachers, 'No nation can be governed by the New Testament alone, nor by the principles which it inculcates; for were we to take Jesus for our King, the Romans or some unchristian kingdom would come and destroy our country and government; for Jesus would not allow us to have a sword or cannon by which to avenge our wrongs—nay, he would have us to turn the other cheek when smitten in the face; and when compelled to go one mile, to make it two.' Grant it in all its force; and what follows? That no one kingdom can become a kingdom of Jesus Christ until all kingdoms become his; and then it follows that the New Testament is only adapted to Christians while citizens of other kingdoms, being under the governments of those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son. Hence the New Testament is only written and adapted to Christians in a suffering state—not as triumphant, not as having the reigns of government in their hands.

But a time will come (and that very soon—sooner than many can be persuaded,) when "the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom; and all *dominions* (kingdoms) shall serve and obey him." But this not until one like the Son of man shall come on the clouds of heaven, and come to the Ancient of Days, and be brought near before him; and there be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages shall serve him.

The government of no nation is now in the hands of those who acknowledge the rights of Messiah—nay, *the best government of this world*, (our own,) may be in the hands of a Turk, a Jew, or an Atheist, for aught our Constitution cares. And this very government is indebted for its comparative excellency to the follies of all other governments in making a court religion, and in causing all, both small and great, to bow to the idol or creed which those in power prefer. The New Testament being only adapted to Christians in a suffering state, it never can mount the throne, nor become a court religion; and, therefore, any religion *called* Christian, which has been by law established, has been an impudent imposition or base counterfeit, and not the religion of Jesus Christ. When Christianity gains the throne, Jesus Christ will place it there himself; and wherever he sets up his throne, from that place shall go forth the law adapted to his subjects in their triumphant state.

We again repeat it, from the sermon on the Mount, to the 4th verse of the 20th chapter of Revelation, every address delivered to Christians contemplated them as suffering adversity. At different periods of the prophecy we have the anticipated triumph spoken of; we hear the echo from afar, saying, "Alleluiah! for the Lord God omnipotent reigns!" "Rejoice over her, you saints, and apostles, and prophets, for God has avenged you on her." "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his anointed, and he shall reign forever and ever." But till Jesus appears in the clouds of heaven, his cause and people can never gain the ascendant.—Now is the time for fighting the good fight—the time that tries men's souls—the time for the perseverance of saints—the time for suffering with him, that with him we may reign.

No kingdom now on earth can be regarded as a kingdom of our Lord, because *they were all founded by the sword.* Ambitious aspirants, political demagogues, successful warriors, triumphant military chieftains laid the foundation of them all. Although revolution may have in some instances changed the sceptre, still they were all founded by the sword. We boast of a government purchased with the blood of our ancestors; of institutions founded by the valor and sealed by the lives of our fathers. A seven year's war was the price of our political redemption, and fifty years' taxation the expense of our liberties. The groans of the dying and wounded, the tears of widows and orphans, the millions of dollars, and the years of travail are yet remembered, at which our political birthrights were valued. But do we forget, or do we not believe that "all who take the sword shall perish by the sword"? Is not this the universal fate of all the nations of the world? And can we expect an exemption from this unchangeable law? We cannot. The injustice, cupidity, ambition, oppression, which are found in our political institutions, will doom this nation to the vials of vengeance, and cause it to go the way of all the earth, before the triumphant day of the Lord come. How rapid is the progress of corruption, and how certain its consummation!

This is the age of improvement in every thing——but morals. Labor-saving expedients spring up like the grass that grows upon the field: but is human labor lessened? Are the toils and drudgery of life diminished by it? Not in the least: for as soon as one invention is adopted, it opens a new field for speculation, new objects of enterprize, and the ever active passions in the human breast impel the children of the flesh into everlasting toils. There can be no radical amelioration of society under the influences which now govern the world. The bonds of friendship, the leagues of society are founded in cupidity or ambition, or in family pride. The social qualities of our nature are all touched with this political magnet, and all our affections move on the hinges of time and sense.

Our religion, if from it were subtracted the cupidity of its teachers, the pride of party, the rage of proselytism, and all the machinery which these propel, would be frittered down to dimensions which

would make the humblest Christian in the land hang his head and be ashamed of himself.

But this state of things is not to survive the message of the angel of an everlasting gospel. He appears as a harbinger of the Millennium. He announces that the year of recompenses for the controsy of Zion has arrived, and assures a sleeping world that the hour of God's judgment has come; that the fate of all the enemies of the reign of Messiah is now sealed, and that consequently a new order of things is to succeed.

Let it be noted, then, that the first and capital item in the everlasting good news, is, that the hour of God's judgment has arrived; that the day of vengeance has come, and that every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people are concerned in it, and to share in its terrors. But how can this be called good news—matter of joy to any people? On this question let us ruminate for another month.

EDITOR.

To Charles Cassedy, Esq.

NO. II.

Respected Sir:—

IN approaching your second objection to the Christian religion, or rather the second difficulty which lies in your way, when you think of a cordial reception of it, permit me to observe, that there are *three* things necessarily submitted to the test of reason, in every pretension to a revelation from God. These are, the message, the intellectual and moral character of the messenger, and the supernatural attestations, or the credentials, by which he is supported:—the miracle, the messenger, and the message; or, perhaps better arranged, the message, the messenger, and the credentials.

Some imagine they find reason to object to the three; others, like yourself, exclusively object to the message, as some way, in their judgment, unworthy of God, or unworthy of man. The pith of your second objection appears to be contained in the following proposition: *That as the globe we inhabit, and the Bible, are said to come from the same Being, to have one and the same Author, the moral attributes, or general character of the Creator, ought to appear the same in nature and religion;* or that the philanthropy which appears in the natural creation, should also appear in the Christian religion. *But you infer that the philanthropy which appears in creation, greatly transcends that which appears in the Christian scheme of redemption.* Hence you object because, in your judgment, *nature and Christianity agree not in their testimony concerning the Almighty;* and, if you are compelled to believe but one of the witnesses, you will, though with great reluctance, believe nature rather than Jesus Christ.

In the analysis which I gave of your letter in my former epistle, I did not thus express your second difficulty. According to my former

letter, "the too narrow and exclusive spirit of the Christian religion, compared with the Divine philanthropy developed in the creation and providence of the Almighty Father and Benefactor of our race, constituted your second capital objection to the Christian religion:" this is, however, to the same effect. It is, sir, with me, a matter of the first importance, in every attempt to aid the inquiries, or to meet the objections of any searcher after truth, to come to the precise point at which his mind halts, and to meet the objection in its full force: you will, therefore, excuse the otherwise unnecessary verbiage with which I have spoken of this difficulty. I wish to have it ferreted out, and distinctly placed before my mental vision, that I may not be found beating the air.

Against the messengers of the Christian religion, or the credentials which they submitted to the test of reason, you offer no objection. It is, therefore, wholly impertinent for me to say any thing of these. Nor do you object to the whole message itself, as either unworthy of God or unworthy of man. Nay, you approve the most of it. That God should propose to bestow immortality on mortal man, and that he should honor our apostate race by sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, to reconcile us to God and to effect for us an eternal redemption, you cannot think to be either incompatible with the glory of God or the best interests of man. That purity and holiness, sometimes called virtue, should constitute the highway to future and eternal happiness, also fully meets your approbation. But one objection seems, for a moment, to outweigh the ten thousand arguments in favor of the mission, the missionaries, and the divine credentials. This objection, too, is but *an inference*, drawn from what some have styled the *doctrines* of Christianity; or rather, from one of those doctrines which represent but a small remnant of mankind as likely to be the participants of this salvation.

In passing, permit me just to say, that Jesus Christ and his Apostles are as silent as the grave upon the relative proportion of the saved and the lost. The relative aggregate of all the generations of men who shall be saved or lost, is no part of the Christian religion. Nothing definite is said or written on this point. It is true that John the Apostle represents an innumerable multitude, which no man could number, of every nation, kindred and tongue, as having attained to immortality; but that many shall be lost, is fully and unequivocally stated, both by our Lord and his Apostles. And let me add, that if you can never submit cordially to the government of Jesus Christ till you discover that every human being shall be saved by him, with the present revelation, and your powers of discrimination, I predict, you will never permit him to be the Sovereign of your heart.

But, sir, I am far from thinking that, with your premises and data before your mind, you will make such a discovery a condition of your acquiescence in the only rational exhibition of religion submitted to the acceptance of a dying world. That some will be saved, and that some will perish with "an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," I do admit is clearly taught

in the Christian scriptures; and that it is not at all incompatible with your own premises and reasonings, from the testimony of nature I hope to make satisfactorily evident to yourself.

But first let me observe, that with the exception of a few Universalists of one particular school, the human race, in all ages, have contended for a future state, of rewards and punishments, of some continuance. The Pagan superstitions, one and all; the Mahometan imposture, the Jews, and the Deists also, have confessed their belief in future punishment. We urge not this almost universal belief, or opinion, as an argument in proof of our position, but rather submit it as an evidence that there is nothing in the idea generally repulsive to the human mind. If not an oracle of reason, it is an oracle to which reason has not found much to object.

But, sir, to approach your difficulty in the direct route of your own premises and reasonings, permit me to call your attention to this very fundamental proposition:—

I. THERE IS NO UNCONDITIONAL FAVOR BESTOWED ON MAN.

The enjoyment of life itself depends upon conditions, a disregard of which must of necessity result in a forfeiture of it. Not a single favor, which contributes to the preservation and comfort of life, has been bestowed on man, which he may not forfeit; which he will not certainly forfeit, if the conditions on which it is bestowed are not complied with. Might not, then, my dear sir, a theorist of some ancient or modern school, make this an argument against the philanthropy of the common Father of our race, because he has made life itself, and all its enjoyments, depend upon conditions which may, through ignorance and imbecility, be neglected or violated, and which through either ignorance or neglect, in countless instances, have caused the forfeiture of life, or health, or happiness? Millions of our race have experienced ten thousand times ten thousand calamities, from their ignorance of these conditions, or from their inability to fulfil them. Could you, my dear sir, place before your eye in one immense group the innumerable multitudes now dragging out a miserable existence, in consequence of having sinned against some law of nature, of having violated the conditions on which health and competence are necessarily consequent;—could you add to these the immense throng who in the morning of life, or in the midst of their days, have been cut off from the generations of the living for refusing obedience to these conditions, or because they were ignorant of them, methinks you would no longer complain that the philanthropy displayed in the gospel differs essentially from that displayed in the works of creation and providence.

But you say, "Exclusive partialities cannot comport with the wisdom, the justice, the *all-absorbing love* of the *Almighty* for his feeble and erring creature, man." This is one of your favorite inferences from the works of creation; but I confess I know not from what premises, found in the volume of nature, this is a fair induction. In following you through your contemplations on this terraqueous globe, and on the lot of man upon it, I am compelled to another conclusion,

which I shall here state as a second proposition, only inferior to the first in importance—

II. *That something like "exclusive partiality" does appear to be an essential part of the system of creation and providence.*

Without examining the circumstances of man in every degree of latitude from Behring's straits to Terra del Fuego, or from Nova Zembla to the Cape of Good Hope; without examining all the influences of climate, soil, government, operating on the physical and moral constitution of man in one hemisphere, if we only select a few we may arrive at sufficient proof to sustain the above proposition.

From the shivering Greenlander to the sun-burnt Moor, what varieties of stature, figure, complexion, beauty, constitution, do we find! what diversities of intellect, moral habits, manners and customs affecting the happiness of man! what various modes of sustaining life from the various products of soil and climate! The human body is known to vary from four feet, as an average stature, to almost seven; and the mind follows it in the same scale of comparative stature, strength, and activity. Here man is an adult of mature age and reason at twelve, and a patriarch at thirty; there his constitution is not formed till twice twelve years have run their race, nor are his days completed till fourscore years have wasted his strength: here he is of a temperament as mild as the genial breath of spring; there, as fierce as the northern blasts which drift the snowy mountains of Spitzbergen: here he pants for breath in the burning deserts of the torrid zone, and there he inters himself under ground to survive the rigors of a nine months' winter: here he is born to affluence, to a throne and a sceptre, and there he sinks into the sordid hut of abject slavery.

His education and moral training are necessarily contingent on all these circumstances, over which he generally has no control. How then infer from these data, from this volume of unequivocal signs, that this "exclusive spirit" of Christianity is at war with the unexclusive philanthropy displayed in creation and providence! The utter impossibility of all men living in the same latitudes, or even in the same temperate zone, lays the foundation of ten thousand diversities in the constitution, character, habits, and circumstances of man, which are as necessary as the law which made this earth a globe. The foundation of this exclusive system is found in the formation of our globe, and in its position to the common centre of our system; and, consequently, is a part of the plan of its omniscient and omnipotent Creator.

Indeed, sir, if we may call all the diversities in the lot of man "partialities;" if all differences found in the family of man must be regarded as tokens of partiality, then is there written on the face of the whole creation nothing so distinctly and so legibly as the *partiality* of its Creator. The spangled heavens, the myriads of shining orbs of various magnitudes and lustre, the fixed stars, the planets primary and secondary, the comets of every eccentricity, proclaim to the listening ear the partiality, as some would call it, of the Almighty

Creator. The oceans, seas, lakes, rivers, with all their scaly tribes; the mountains, hills, vallies, and plains; the immense continents; the sandy deserts; the vast morasses; the barren cloud-capt peaks; and all the spicy islands, with all their tribes of inhabitants, loudly proclaim that God delights in variety.

The susceptibilities of pleasure and pain, the capacity for sensitive, rational, and moral enjoyment are as diversified as the physical constitution of the spheres and all their inhabitants—no two things alike in all respects, as far as human science can explore. Why, then, should it be thought an insurmountable objection to the word of eternal life, that all will not—that all cannot embrace it? Does not creation, does not the providence of its Almighty Author preach the same lesson in ten thousand varied types, figures, and analogies? Can all of any class become like one of that class, or like one of another class? Making nature (which is but a co-witness) the judge of revelation, trying the oracles of religion by those of reason, comparing the voice which speaks in every creature, with that of Apostles and Prophets, in my ear there is no discord. Nature and the Bible speak the same lesson. My aphorism is, *that which is just in little is just in much; that which is unjust in a farthing is unjust in a million.* Thus taught the great Prophet. From all of which my reason concludes that if it be compatible with the wisdom, justice, and philanthropy of our heavenly Father to allow these diversities in the children of one family to exist in this state of human existence; if he have made animal life and enjoyment depend on conditions which may easily be broken; if he have so governed this world for six thousand years, as to keep before our eyes a continued scene of varied suffering and distress in consequence of sinning against the laws of nature, who can infer from these premises that it will be incompatible with his whole moral character to save those who honor and obey his Son, and to condemn all who reject the Messiah and despise the salvation of God!

Thus, sir, I am led to the conclusion that nature, which is another name for creation, and christianity concur exactly in their testimony concerning God. If these two witnesses are attentively heard, and their testimony fairly interpreted, it will appear that no two witnesses ever more perfectly harmonized in identifying the character of any person, than do the works and word of God in attesting his character to man.

But, sir, suppose that in interpreting their testimony (for men are just as much divided in interpreting the testimony of the works of God as in interpreting his word) a discord or contradiction should appear, a question arises which of the two witnesses is to be believed. "Neither of them," says the Atheist. "Nature," says the Theist. Both are equally capricious. Could we suppose such a discrepancy in fact, I would undertake to show that revelation is the most credible and intelligible guide. I would find an offset to the allegation that the latter witness is more liable to interpolation and misinterpretation than the former, in the contradictory testimonies of all the polytheists of ancient and modern times. But this is wholly gratuitous: for the

works and word of God give but one and the same testimony, though neither would be intelligible without the other; but when both are fully and fairly heard, there is the fullest assurance given that God is just and merciful, as well as infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness. Your third objection I must defer till another moon.

With high consideration and respect, I remain, &c.

EDITOR.

Reply to Epaphras---No. 6.

Dear Sir,

YOUR favor of last month had to appear without a reply. The documents on hand then, and still, if they do not altogether exclude, must limit my replies. But, sir, I would not have you thence infer that your correspondence is not acceptable to myself and others, nor that I view your letters as not demanding the immediate attention of myself and all my readers. Such inferences would do me great injustice; for I assure you that all your letters, and the last especially, are worthy of our most serious consideration. In reply to that before me, which appeared in the preceding number, I would remark, that if these things are so, they merit not only your remonstrance, but the solemn consideration of all concerned. You rightly conclude that our aim is not merely a reformation of opinions, nor of sentiment only—not a reformation of modes and forms of worship, but of moral and religious practice.

You ask, "Where is their self-denying obedience; their edifying conversation and demeanor; their labors of love for the comfort of the more indigent?" &c. Now, sir, much more than you intended may be insinuated by such a question as this; and something may be asked which it would not be agreeable to modesty, humility, and the unostentatious spirit of our profession to answer in terms direct and explicit. You would not expect me to recount the acts of charity, the labors of love, nor to enumerate the instances of self-denying obedience of all the disciples in the ranks of the reformation, which might have come under my observation. But, perhaps, you intended no more than to call the attention of all the disciples to the *doing* part of their profession; and thus to prevent them from falling into a very common error—the substitution of sound principles for sound practices. I would not, however, that you should regard my answer to this question as an evasion of it, or an expedient to elude a difficulty which might seem to entangle us who plead for a restoration of primitive Christianity. I might, with the utmost truth, and, I think, with the strictest propriety, say, that I know many of the brethren in this reformation as conspicuous for their practical conformity to the precepts of the Lord and his Apostles, as they are zealous for correct views and just conceptions of the doctrine of Christ. But this may not be as general as the reformation principles are acknowledged, and it is not for me to pronounce on such cases as may have come under your

immediate notice. I am sorry to confess that I have found some instances within my own acquaintance, where the zeal for a restoration of primitive usages was not seconded by a corresponding zeal for the self-denied conformity of the first converts. But as there is scope for reformation, and as reformation is the profession of all our brethren, it is to be hoped that in this they will yet reform.

Gaiety, levity, and all fashionable conformity to the world, are, in the common sense of christendom, apostate as it is, directly opposed to the genius of our religion. Some, however, may confound cheerfulness with gaiety and levity; and a due respect for personal and family neatness, with a fashionable conformity to the world. It is not easy to fix a landmark as prominent as the Andes between that apparel and domestic economy and taste which comport with Christian principles, and that of the world so called. It is easy to discover that we are ten degrees north or south of the equator; but not so easy to ascertain the moment we cross the line; so to perceive that we are a few degrees on this side or on that of the equator of Christian decorum requires no extraordinary acuteness of moral vision; but the precise points at which we cross the line, or depart from it, may not unfrequently escape the detection of the most piercing optics. Again, what may be allowable with respect to calling, circumstances, and our connexions with society in general; and what may be absolutely right or wrong, without regard to any relation which may be sustained in reference to society, may require the superior discernment of a gifted few, and cannot always be decided with that easy certainty by which we distinguish truth from falsehood, or a straight line from a curve. But this we may say: When the mind is devoted to such concerns, and the heart cares for them on any other account than as means of becoming useful to certain casts in society, or relishes them for their own sake, it is out of the path which reason and religion alike sanction and approve.

When I see a "Christian" toiling from year to year to keep cast with the world, and straining his utmost to make a good appearance, I am compelled to fear that he has not found in Christ the pearl of great great price—that he has drawn a blank rather than a prize in assuming the Christian name. But that Christians are not to become Monks—to assume a long face and a whining tone—to change their costume, and place devotion in the obtusity of the angles of their apparel, I know you are as far from imagining as I am. That there is any thing spiritual or celestial in the shape of a shad more than in the figure of a salmon, or in the color of grey, or brown, or drab, more than in blue or green—that there is any thing more devout in horn or whalebone, than in brass or steel; or in the collar, rather than in the skirts of a mantle, I presume is as evident to you as that all colors are alike in the dark.

But you pass from these matters to the family circle and to family devotion. And here you ask, "What do they more than others?" Nay, you affirm, that "many of them, to your certain knowledge, come far short of the attentions to family edification which prevail amongst

the religious of other sects." My brethren, these things ought not so to be. Do you excuse yourselves by saying that you can find no command nor precedent for "family worship?" Some I have heard express doubts upon the propriety of adopting such forms. But what do you call family worship? Is it a morning and evening ceremony of reading, singing, and praying, as a part of the regular business of the family? If this be family worship, indeed you may talk lightly of it. But what is the name? Because the words "family worship" are not found in the book, or expressive of certain forms, are we thence to infer that reading the Scriptures, and teaching them to our children and households—that singing the praises of the Lord, and calling upon his name constantly in our families, is no part of our Christian duty or privilege! Was it from Abraham, Moses, Joshua, David, or our Apostle Paul, that you learned this? Surely not from Abraham; for of Abraham his God said, "I know Abraham that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Not from Moses, who commanded the fathers of Israel diligently to teach the oracles to their children; "to talk of them when sitting in the house, when walking by the way, when lying down, and when rising up."* Not from Joshua, who vowed, saying, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." Not from David, who sang upon his harp, that "in the dwellings of the righteous is heard the melody of praise." Nor from Paul, who taught Christian fathers to "bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

But why seek for examples when Christians are commanded to pray with *all prayer* and supplication in the Spirit, and to watch with *all thanksgiving*—when all Christians are commanded to have the word of Christ dwelling in them richly; and to teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, &c. Nor need we proceed to show that it is utterly out of the power of any person to educate a family in the fear of the Lord, unless he daily and constantly abound in reading and teaching the holy oracles, and continue in prayer and supplications night and day.

As well might one expect to reap without sowing, as to think of bringing up a family to the Lord while neglecting habitually those religious instructions, precepts, and examples, which are the means of consecration to the Lord. And does any one ask a warrant for Christians praying together, and having communion with one another in prayer and praises? What more delightful than to unite with each other on our knees, before the throne of God, in the name of our glorified Lord; or to mingle our voices in songs of praise to him who washed us from our sins in his own blood?

But I need not argue this matter, as I am not personally acquainted with any disciple, who has a believing wife, or who is the head of a family, who says that it is either unlawful or inexpedient to read the oracles, to sing the high praises of the Lord, and to call upon his

*Gen. xviii. 19. *Deut.* vi. 7—8. *Josh.* xxiv. 15.

name daily and constantly in his family as well as in his closet. And certainly all who have attended to the worship of God and the instruction of their families daily and constantly, have, in their superior domestic enjoyment, and in the comparative intelligence and spiritual prosperity of their households, experienced that it was good for them thus to wait upon the Lord, and that in keeping his commandments there is great reward.

What more interesting scene in this sin worn world than a well disciplined Christian family! How beautiful and influential its order! The parents walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord; the children, like olive plants in the garden of the Lord, under the dew of heaven, growing up in the knowledge and instruction of the Lord! In the morning assembled to hear the words of God's Prophets and Apostles, to listen in profound attention to the voice of the Almighty Father, and to bow upon his footstool at the throne of mercy and favor! The affectionate parents mingling the reading of the word with questions, explanations, and exhortations, and holding up to the admiration of the children the holy men and women of eternal renown, and occasionally calling their attention to the causes of the ruin and destruction of nations, families, and individuals. Thus are they taught to say with David, "My voice shalt thou hear in the morning, O Lord! In the morning will I direct my prayer to thee, and will look up." The influence of this morning worship and instruction pervades the day, and at every meal the Father of mercies is invoked and his name adored. The business of the day is despatched in harmony and affection, with all diligence and propriety. In the evening they again assemble around the Family Bible and take another lesson from the Spirit of God. The intelligent and affectionate father, the priest of his family, makes them understand the reading and pours the heavenly instructions into their minds with all prayer and supplication. They raise the hymn of thanksgiving, and mingle their voices in celebrating the faithfulness of God every evening. Thus they grow in the wisdom which comes from above every day, and lay themselves down to sleep under the protection of the Almighty. Their children arise and call them blessed, and are thus prepared to hand down to their children and generations yet unborn the faith and knowledge which dwelt in their parents; and thus they scatter the seeds of truth and piety far and wide through society.

You well observe, my dear sir, that families are the nurseries of both church and state; and as the plants are reared in the nursery, so will be the trees when planted out in the plantations of nature and of grace:—

"As the twig is bent the tree's inclin'd."

This matter we need not argue: I presume it is generally conceded; and if not universally practised by all who profess reformation, will, I doubt not, be, on proper reflection, as universal as the Christian profession.

As to the duties of the congregations professing primitive Christianity, you have left me nothing to say. Many congregations are

only beginning to reform, and most of them need to perfect what they have begun. Until the first day of the week is sanctified to the Lord, and his death, resurrection, and ascension be regarded as the business of the day, we must say, before heaven and earth, that, in our judgment, and according to our Christian experience, spiritual health and prosperity cannot be enjoyed by any community.

Your remarks upon the different views with which persons now approach Christian immersion, compared with those of the first converts, explain many difficulties occurring every day; and the want of that joy unspeakable and full of glory, which distinguished the great majority of ancient disciples. To your remarks we will request the attention of our readers again.

In all esteem, EDITOR.

KING & QUEEN, *January* 7, 1833.

To Philalethes.

Dear Sir,

YOUR views of the word of God, as the grand instrument of salvation, are, in general, entitled to very high respect, being well calculated to edify and confirm the disciples of Christ in the discharge of their numerous and multiform duties. One important idea advanced by you, probably more than a year ago, elicited from me what I designed to be a respectful communication, setting forth objections to that idea. I thought that in your reply you manifested a very different temper from what your calm, profound, and philosophical course of writing had led me to think you possessed. So far from being patient under what you might have considered impertinence in me, and willing to relieve me of my embarrassment as to the scripture doctrine of *discipling*, by enlightening my mind, you wrote several sharp pages, directly aimed, without, at the same time time, seeming to know what I was really at. For in conclusion you know, you requested me to inform you what I designed in objecting to your essay upon *discipling*. I think that any one may discover, on reading my communication, that I was disturbed by your learned essay upon *Matheteuo;* in which essay, if you are right, I found myself and a multitude of others radically wrong, and actually misleading many more. The great importance of the subject, then, was my reason for addressing you, and is now my apology for calling up the matter once more in conclusion. But it may be objected, "It is too late; the iron has become cold. Let the subject drop." This is a subject which is not easily worn out before those who are apprised of its magnitude. To believe the truth is good; but to be confirmed and strengthened in it is better: we thus add grace to grace. It so happens, however, that while numerous causes operated to prevent me from being more explicit than I was at first, our mutual friend *Inquirer* interposed and saved me the trouble thus far. And as I find by what he and brother Campbell have together said, your arguments are probably pretty well elicited, it will be unnecessary to propose any thing like premises or argument in addition on my part. I presume that if you have any thing more conclusive on the subject, it will be presented in reply to brother Campbell's last remarks. I felt truly surprized at his reluctance to admit the existence of a real and important difference between yourself and Inquirer, which you so plainly saw and forcibly expressed. The difference is truly great, and of great importance in the reformation now proposed. I pray you, sir, to sift it to the bottom. Though I decline, as just now intimated, to take up this subject formally again, particularly under the aspect in which it was at first presented, I must

still beg leave to call your discriminating mind to the consideration of *sectarianism* as now existing in christendom, with all its evils, *as the natural and unavoidable effect of the cause you are laboring to establish.* Let me be fairly understood. I say, then, that it appears to me that *merely mental christianity is the true parent of sectarianism.* The truth of this position may be deduced from the present state of the christian world. Is there one among all the sects of the world, from those who are so antinomian as to do nothing, to the Shaker in all his ecstacies, who do not make *mere mental operations and emotions* the main pillar of their systems? And how can it be otherwise? We have a standard, it is true; but how is it to be applied? All sects venture to apply it to the state of the mind, *as set forth by the words of the individual.* Christianity itself requires this to be done, it is true; but does not, as does sectarianism, stop here; but goes on to propose and enforce its *only means* of setting up a kingdom on earth, wherein is required *a unity of body, spirit, and action.* Just for a moment reflect upon the difference between christianity itself and the present state of things. The one in its primitive use and progress actually exhibiting the extraordinary phenomena of one body, one spirit, and one great course of action; while the other presents an inexhaustible fountain of incalculable evils with the good that it accomplishes. And what is the great cause of this? I would say, *mere mental christianity?* the doctrine so greedily devoured by all who prefer their own ways to the way of the Lord, and will talk of, and teach men, that the *heart,* the *heart* is all—set the heart right, and we are christians, whether we go into the kingdom or stay out; who talk of essentials and non-essentials in the Lord's house; of this "bodily" act, and the other mere ceremony! Is Messiah crowned, and yet his subjects treat him thus? But you may reply, "I do not contend for what you have described. I would not only have them *real* or *mental christians,* but likewise *avowed* disciples, by submission even in immersion." But all the mischievous force of your doctrine remains to divide christianity. One professes faith in the Saviour, and you tell him that he is now a *real disciple* of Christ, a christian to all intents and purposes; but must also teach him that there is one important promise comprised in the last words, most solemn words of the just ascending Saviour, which he *cannot* as he is, he *must* not presume to claim on earth, to wit: "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved.*" "But, sir, did you not teach me that my heart being duly affected and improved, of which I am the sole judge on earth, I was thereby constituted a *real christian?* I desire no more; and shall proceed to unite myself to some of the pious sects of the day, who discard as unnecessary, and as you admit it to be, a mere avowal of what I am,—your baptism." And can you venture to say to such a one, that by his course of disobedience to the Lord, you infer that his heart is not divinely changed? Or must you not rather concede that the doctrine which you so honestly and zealously propagate with all the multitude of sects, is of all things the best calculated to make sectarians, distract christendom, destroy the unity of the body of Christ, and make by *human tradition* the commandments of God of no effect? Such a cause as that for which you contend, can hardly fail to produce the most lamentable effects upon the materials produced by our world Why, sir, so extensively destructive is it of every thing like a submission to the requisitions of the Saviour, that it is now-a-days no strange thing for every upright man, who seems religiously disposed, to be spoken of as a christian. Christianity demands the whole man, soul, body, and spirit; and not only in mind and in word, but also indeed and in truth. She claims him for her own, making him so internally that he may consummate her work by becoming so externally.

This branch of the subject of *discipling,* being all that I thought it proper to take up, the main question having been pretty fairly settled, is respectfully submitted by

John

Testimony of an Individual,

IN FAVOR OF THE ANCIENT GOSPEL.

Dear brother Campbell,

AS I have been induced, within the last few weeks, to embrace the principles of the reformation, I wish to present you with a brief account of my religious career, hoping it may prove advantageous to some of your readers. The joy and peace which fill my heart, constrain me to bear testimony to the power of the ancient gospel.

All my endeavors, since I began to think any thing of religion, have been directed to the pursuit of that peace of mind, which I was persuaded the gospel of Jesus was calculated to impart. I sought it, too, in a way in which others told me they had found it, as being nearest to the truth of any. I sought faith by special operation—was buried with Christ in baptism—was orthodox in my sentiments—consistent in my conduct—was prepared in a College for the ministry—and preached, as I thought, the gospel to perishing sinners. But, alas! I found no peace—there was always an aching void within—there was trouble and perplexity, instead of peace and confidence. Arminianism I abhorred, and Calvinism did not suit me. The numerous difficulties and inconsistencies which beset all the doctrines, as held by the sects, were insuperable objections to my receiving them. I was too refractory to submit to human arguments and decisions, while my conscience and judgment could not give them the most unqualified approval.

When I could not find satisfaction in the systems, as taught by men, I turned my attention to the conduct of the Christian world, hoping there to find something satisfactory. I was persuaded that holiness of heart and life was the only true test of the religion of Jesus. But in this respect I was more perplexed than ever. The only conclusion I could make, was either that religion was not true, or that professors were ignorant of its nature and tendency. It seemed that by some means, the fountain of life was corrupted; and, consequently, that all the streams partook of its impurity. Religion was spread extensively, but it was only in name. There was the form of godliness without the power—a great profession of love, but there was little of that spirit of submission to the authority of Jesus, by which love can be evidenced. There was disunion, uncharitableness, want of confidence, envy, strife, underhand dealings, and an almost total conformity to the world—and, awful to relate, among the ministers of the word, who set themselves up as examples to the flock, there was proverbial inconsistency, and greater domestic unhappiness in their families, than is found in the families of the world.

With these considerations there was also another, which filled up the measure of my perplexity—the tendency of all systems to engender bondage. O! I could tell tales of woe, that would move the hardest heart. Many have I known, who, in search of hope and peace, had been driven to despair, and were for years the children of the

deepest affliction. Often has it been my lot to be invited to administer comfort to the broken-hearted; and in directing the weary and heavy laden soul to the Son of the Blessed, the friend of sinners, I have sometimes succeeded and oftener failed. But I enjoyed not myself the peace I was the means of imparting. Every thing, in a word, combined to unsettle my mind and convince me that all was wrong in the Christian world.

In this state I remained a considerable time, and having travelled through various parts of England and Scotland for three years, I resolved on giving up the ministry and proceeding to America. I hoped in Canada to find the state of religion more congenial to my feelings than I had found it at home. It was my design to settle on land, and make myself useful on the Lord's day. I arrived at Upper Canada, September, 1831, and in a short time joined a Baptist church; but I found the state of things nearly the same. In some matters there was a reformation—in a plurality of elders and weekly communion; but the errors at the fountain head were still the same, and consequently there was no change in the state of my mind. I then began more boldly to investigate the systems of men. For some time the system by which my views had been formed prevented me from doing this in a way that promised a satisfactory result. However, one thing led on to another, till I had got to a considerable extent on the principles of the reformation. I opened my mind to a friend, and intimated my intention of renouncing all sects and going forth as a missionary to show men how far they had departed from the truth.

About this time I had a long and interesting conversation with a pious follower of Jesus, who had long renounced all human systems. The popular notion of special influences was the chief subject of our discourse. Prior to this I had been quite unsettled on the subject; but was really afraid of venturing too far on what I thought dangerous ground. He greatly relieved my mind, and at the same time told me of your publications. With the greatest eagerness I obtained as many of them as I could, and read them—O! with what feelings I leave you to conjecture. They were the messengers of peace to me, and with a grateful heart I wish to acknowledge the advantage I have derived from perusing them. I opened my Bible with new eyes—a world of light burst upon my soul—I discovered the beauty and divine simplicity of the gospel of Jesus, so as I had never seen it before—I felt that I only then began to exist—the world was no longer a dreary blank—I saw for what purpose I was placed in it, and my heart became the abode of peace, of purity, and love.

O what a luxury it was to read the blessed words of eternal life, and discover the harmony and tendency of all its parts!—to see Jesus seated on his glorious throne, requiring the unqualified submission of all his followers, as the test of their devotion and love—and to see in a consistent light the reasons and motives by which obedience was enforced and love brought into operation, and faith and hope confirmed. O! blessed is he whose eyes are opened to see the truth as it is in Jesus! He shall enjoy the peace of God, which passes all understanding, and that joy which is unutterable and full of glory.

I have only now to add, that with much prayer I have given your sentiments a candid and laborious examination. I have not adopted them at the impulse of the moment, but have carefully compared them with the unerring word of truth; and no way is left me, consistent with my duty and happiness, but to adopt them That you may enjoy the peace and satisfaction which is now my portion, in all your labor of love, and be made the means of imparting the same to many, is the earnest prayer of yours, affectionately, in the bonds of the gospel, FRANCIS HUTCHINSON.

February 16, 1833.

Progress of Reform.

KING & QUEEN, VA. 1st January, 1833.

Brother Campbell—ANY thing concerning the present reformation, whether favorable or otherwise, from the different parts of our country, will be considered more or less worthy of a place in the Harbinger. If things go ill with us, it is well to be known, that a remedy may be applied if possible; and if well, then we may rejoice, give thanks, and take courage.

I design to furnish a brief sketch of the religious, or some of the religious movements and affairs of this neighborhood. A mere letter is all I wish to offer. But by the way it may be remarked, that the last nine years having developed so many valuable results touching the Christian religion, in this quarter, as well as in many others, ranging from high-toned, strait-jacketed *Calvinism*, to what is commonly called *Campbellism* among us; the last to be learned particularly and *only* among the files of the Religious Herald; it seems very desirable that something in form of a short history of these important events be prepared faithfully for the use of future generations. If this is not shortly done, the *methodus medendi* of old diseases will be forgotten, and the actual means of cure denied. But it may be better let alone, for aught I know, at least for a while; for some people would choose to remain sick rather than to acknowledge a cure by certain agents; and some who are getting well, might relapse.

A considerable sensation seems to pervade the community of our Baptist brethren. Never, probably, did a more extraordinary state of things exist. While, on the one hand, some of the more conspicuous leaders of the Dover Association, are anathematizing the reformers, the arrogant reformers, and deprecating before Heaven the demoralizing and disorganizing tendency of their views and practices, they are actually thrusting themselves into the very course to which we are endeavoring to point our fellow-creatures. Let it be understood, however, that they are not chargeable with *saying* all we say, though they *require and do* the greater part of what we ourselves do. Though they like most of the things very well, they heartily abhor the circumstance that forces them to confess, that while they were dreaming away their twenty, thirty, or forty years, it fell to the lot of others to develope views and practices consonant with the word of life, and most happily adapted to the capacities and wants of men. And now, nothing in the world can more highly offend such, than the suggestion that they have been sleeping: and yet, most strange to tell! many of them will frequently spend an hour in lecturing one another, especially when a particular stir is desired, upon the text, "It is high time to *awake out of sleep*," &c. without ever imagining that, in a religious sense, they might be as sound *asleep* as their *hearers*. But as we would do to others, should we not be willing they should do to us? It is no strange thing to hear from the pulpit a torrent of hard sayings of the reformers and their sayings and doings; and yet the more discerning, who have made themselves acquainted with the course pursued by us, say that these very persons

frequently enforce some of the most prominent features of the reformation; taking care, be it remembered, *always* to avoid what Peter told the inquiring penitent Jews on the day of Pentecost. Let alone remission of sins, and all else may be said. How long is this state to continue? I should say, until the public mind is fairly enlightened upon these topics, and the brethren who thus act are made ashamed of their perverse course. But we derive great courage from even this state of things. It teaches us that truth is mighty, and may one day or other prevail. We are thus made confident that we are not propagating wicked nonsense, but the simple way of life and salvation; and like Paul we are enabled to rejoice at the promulgation of truth in any quantity or under any circumstances.

Take things all in all in this quarter, and we may say that they promise well. An originally primitive church has been organized in Caroline county; one chiefly from Piscataway church, in Essex; the Lower College church, in King William; another from the Mangohick division in the same county; the Upper College church, in the same county; and what will probably be called the Union church, in this neighborhood, out of Bruington, have all, in one way or another, taken up the reformation. Besides which, it is believed that most of the churches between this section and the bay shore are favorable to the cause. The effects of the proceedings of the late Dover Association, I trust, will be truly serviceable. We humbly hope that the great body of the people within the limits of this body will act for themselves, above the guardianship of this most extraordinary dictator. We hope further, that our Baptist brethren, only a small, very small part of whom, we think, would deliberately take this stand, will likewise do themselves the justice to hear and judge for themselves. I have prepared a reply to the report of the Association, for which a place was sought in the Herald, through whose pages the report had been circulated; but in vain. I asked for a place for the reply of the Lower College church; which was also refused. These documents will probably appear in a few weeks in pamphlet form.

You know the Baptists are admonished not to "encourage" or "countenance" the persons cut off. But I find that the *bull* is not so readily swallowed. Many of the Baptists in this quarter are the legitimate sons of the fathers of the Revolution;—they feel still the influence of that noble triumph; and while the tree of civil liberty withstands the tempests of time, they will never—no, I feel certain that they will never yield their *rights of conscience* to the domination of *a clerical despotism.* You have doubtless ere this seen the worse than abortive effort of Elder Broaddus to clear up this matter.

What a cruel word is *persecution!* This brother is naturally opposed (in other words, his temperament is altogether contrary) to such grating and harsh charges; and were his premises but sound, or did his exposure of your sayings about the Association possess any premises, then might his conclusions be called arguments of different sorts, as he says they are. As there is certainly *no fitness* in his illustrations, it would have been beside the power of any other art than sophistry, to produce any thing like an argument from them. He seems not to notice the difference between a *schism* and a mere division or separation of a religious body; nor, that we neither present the case of *an excluded member of a church, (who of course has been charged, proved to be guilty of sin, and condemned by the law of God,* not the church or association, without *charge, witness, or law*)—or the case of the Paidobaptists. Now if Elder Broaddus has laid his charge correctly as to this last argument, alleging that you have excluded the Paidobaptists, I shall be glad to know when and where it happened. But we expect you to do both him and the public justice upon this exposure.

I intended to include the constitution of the congregation recently organized in this neighborhood, but do not find room. The congregation is going on well, meeting and breaking bread, &c. nearly every Lord's day. It has somewhat over thirty members, nearly all from Bruington. Among other strange things, the mother church, Bruington, presents at this time quite an

interesting aspect. Compared with her order ten years ago, it is truly astonishing, and cheering to every friend of a growth in grace and knowledge. Within the last few months her members have been in the habit of meeting every Lord's day, reading the word, praying, giving words of lecture and exhortation, and singing psalms or spiritual songs. "Surely into the very *ancient gospel* itself," you are ready to exclaim. But not quite; yet so near it, we cannot for our life see why they should not *break bread* and make regular *contribution*. And after all, these brethren, many of them at any rate, seem proud to take a stand against the reformation!

With one more remark I must close my letter. It is a fact, which I presume none will deny, that the great mass of the intelligent members who came into the Baptist churches about us, in 1831, stand upon reformation principles. They made no pretensions to extraordinary manifestations, set forth none in their details of experience, and will now, I have no doubt, declare their hope of future happiness not to depend chiefly upon frames of mind, but upon the immutable promises of God and a correspondent deportment. All these things declare our labor not to be in vain in the Lord. Great efforts are made in this quarter to keep down this work. It was so in the days of Christ and the Apostles; and as those efforts then only set off truth more strikingly, so now must great things be accomplished among an intelligent and inquisitive people. I still trust that the Baptist people will be one, and that the day is not very remote when we shall again worship under the same vine. But we must first witness and have to bear much distraction and hard treatment. In accordance with the wishes of the Association, and I apprehend somewhat with the heart of the individual, a respectable minister was requested a few weeks ago to announce notice that I would deliver a discourse at a certain place of worship, free for all parties; which he refused to do, admitting at the same time, that he would treat the reformers as *gentlemen and friends*, [mark it!] but would not do this thing!

Wishing you grace, mercy, and peace, I remain yours in the hope of the gospel, J. DU VAL.

JACKSON, Lawrence county, Arkansas Territory, November 29th, 1832.

THE doctrine of reformation is rapidly progressing in our remote territory. All the preachers of the Baptist denomination, who are men of intelligence, and who know any thing of the *ancient order of things*, are proclaiming it, fearless of opposition.

Other denominations are beginning to see, "as through a glass darkly," and some are striving to get into the full glow of gospel light. Those who are wedded to the present order of things appear determined to live in Babylon, and to share her destinies; but they are few. All that is lacking with us to restore a *pure speech* to the Israel of God, is more information. For this, you must know, we are in some degree lacking. Though we have the Bible, the original source of true information, yet the *sheep* of God's fold have been divided in a dark and cloudy day, and a veil has been cast over all nations by the disquisitions and commentaries of the various sectaries which have spread over Christendom; so that every sectary sees through their respective *glasses*, so that the Bible must read as does the creed. Thus men are infatuated, and the light extinguished.

DAVID ORR.

FAYETTE COUNTY, Ind. February 12, 1833.

THE disciples are multiplying, and the proclaimers are becoming more skillful in handling the word of life. A few churches round here have prevailed on brother O'Kane to take the field for one year. He is an indefatigable and faithful laborer; nor does he labor in vain. There has been added to the army of the faith one for every day he has been in the field. He was formerly of the "Christian" body; and I am sorry to say that some of them have joined with the sectarians to bring him into disrepute; but they have overshot their mark, and I have no doubt it will turn out to the advancement of the kingdom. I think, my dear sir, there is a mistake in sending out one by one. The Lord of life sent out two and two. The church at Jerusalem sent out Peter and John; the church, or rather the Holy Spirit, sent out Paul and Barnabas; Barnabas took John Mark, and Paul took Silas; but in all the good book where do we read of their sending out but one? Ought not this to be considered? The question now is, How were the churches able to do this? Now, brother, I want to provoke you in your luminous and forcible manner to answer this question, by setting before the churches the first 8 verses of John's letter to Gaius, and other portions of the same import. Letters of recommendation, then, will be letters of credit; and the brethren bearing testimony of the good deeds of the faithful, will provoke very many. This is surely a part of the new institution. I am sorry I cannot add, that the churches here have become imitators of the churches of God which were in Judea in Christ Jesus. I do not know, nor have I heard of one congregation in this state who are walking in *all* the commandments and institutions of the Lord blame less. We have middle ground men here. They would be reformers, could they be leaders.

WM. M'PHERSON.

FAYETTE, Mo. Feb. 9, 1833.

FROM these western ends of the earth, I have thought proper to write a line or two to you, and inform you that the progress of reform is making some pretty good show amongst us. A small church has been raised up in this town amidst severe opposition, and persecution from professors of different creeds; but hitherto we have stood firm and unshaken on the word of God as the only rule of our faith and practice as disciples of Christ.

On last Lord's day a Methodist Preacher, by name William W Redman, in high standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, immersed six adults near this place, four of whom were sprinkled before, one thirty years of age. During the whole time the candidates were immersed, the Presiding Elder and the Preacher in charge of this Circuit, stood on the bank at some distance from the water, with looks and exclamations of considerable disapprobation; but the candidates were determined to be immersed; and the preacher, at all hazards, would not lose them from his church on that account.

I will now inform you, that not long since there came several papers into this office, directed to the subscribers of the Millennial Harbinger at Fayette. On examining them they proved to be an Extra of the Christian Herald, containing an abusive letter addressed to you by S. C. Jennings, which no doubt you have seen by this time. I took the liberty of returning them to the publisher.

Yours in the bonds of Christian fellowship,

J. GILL.

Victory, N. Y. February 10, 1833.

THE ancient gospel is gaining ground more rapidly that I could have supposed. After a protracted struggle to obtain articles of faith introduced into the church, (for we had not used any for more than three years,) we have finally separated; and the brethren and sisters who wished to be guided by the Scriptures alone, have associated together, elected their officers, and are endeavoring to maintain the ancient order of God's house. Our number is between 30 and 40. Our Baptist brethren are very industrious, laboring to misrepresent our views, and to support their idol of 18 Articles. In the town of Ira, adjoining Victory, the good seed of the kingdom has been sown with good effect. Nine disciples organized by choosing their Bishop and Deacon; one was immediately received, two confessed their faith the next Lord's day, and are only waiting for much water that they may be baptized. Others will soon make the good confession; and a considerable number will soon join them from the Baptist church in Cato and Ira.

JOHN M. BARTLETT.

Beavertown, O. February 12, 1833.

THERE was a church planted at this place several years ago by B. H. Miles and some other laborers in the Christian cause, which grew for a season. About four years since brothers Hughes, Rogers, Secrest, and Mitchell, held a three days meeting, proclaiming immersion for the remission of sins. Several came out in the reformation; and the former church would not fellowship those of the late reformation. Their Elder (F. Edward) took a journey into Babylon, and nearly all the disciples followed and fell in with the Reformed Methodists. We endured considerable persecution; met nearly every Lord's day for prayer and exhortation, without much prosperity. Last year our congregations began to increase. In this place and its vicinity there have been between twenty and thirty immersed, several of them belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church; of course we have been scorched with the fire of zeal. But amidst all this persecution and misrepresentation our congregations continue to increase, and frequent additions are made.

HENRY J. DEAVER.

Geneva, Morgan county, Ill. February 4, 1833.

THE good cause is still gaining ground here, and challenging investigation in almost every mind. I am glad to see it so. Brother

Josephus Hewitt has immersed between sixty and seventy persons at Carrolton, Greene county, who are said to be doing well, though they meet with much opposition from their sectarian neighbors. They meet every "first day" to observe all the ordinances of the Lord's house; and there is generally some addition or additions.

At Winchester, 16 miles west of Jacksonville, the disciples formed themselves into a congregation, eight weeks since, in order to worship God, and build each other up in 'the most holy faith.' They number about twenty. Some additions were expected yesterday; but I have not heard whether their anticipations were realized.

At Jacksonville there are occasional additions, and the brethren walk together in love, and grow in favor and in the knowledge of the truth, as even their enemies acknowledge; and the more mild generally remark, "There is one thing in the reformers which, to say the least, I like—that is, the simplicity of their manner and their order." I hope this "simplicity and order" will continue to be their characteristics. If the disciples but do their duty, all will be well.

HENRY A. CYRUS.

RAMSAY'S CREEK, Pike County, Missouri, February 7th, 1833.

Dear Brother—SINCE I received the Prospectus you sent me, a number of us have organized under the New Testament alone; and as a congregation we discard all human and authoritative creeds, traditions, and humanisms, believing them to be unscriptural and unworthy bonds of union. Our number is thirty-four, and we look for an increase at our next meeting. The sects have commenced persecution, and are rallying their forces for a crusade against us. May the Lord help us to brook sternly all opposition and sustain the best of all causes! It is beginning to be discovered that the Methodist fortress is not impregnable here, for the ancient gospel has actually penetrated her walls, and several have been immersed for remission. The Baptists, to whom some of us formerly belonged, are very proscriptive; though, I think, to no profit. People are beginning to read for themselves; light is elicited, priestcraft is losing its charms, and of course sectarianism and infidelity must recede. It is not my opinion that the sects will possess themselves of the great valley of the Mississippi, for which they have been striving. There are three congregations of reformers here, viz.—at Ramsay's Creek, Pike county; Cuiver, Lincoln county; and at Troy, Lincoln county; all within the compass of 20 miles.

Since writing the above I have been informed by a brother, that another congregation has recently been formed in the compass above named.

JAMES JEANS.

FLEMING COUNTY, Ky. January 14, 1833.

THE Baptists in my neighborhood, unanimously declaring in favor of a restoration to apostolic order in the church, we united on the Bible and organized a church upon the new institution. This union

embraced members from four sects, viz.—Baptists, Methodists, Christian body, and Tunkers. This church consists of about one hundred members, and we are prospering. We are walking in love, and are of the same faith, acknowledging the "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism." Brother Batson, of Millersburg, Ky. visits us monthly. He is an able proclaimer of the ancient gospel. Much remains to be done; but by the grace of God we are for carrying out the principles of the reformation until the church of Christ is purged of all the filth that attends bigotry and sectarian spleen. O that the Lord may help us to cry aloud and spare not, nor rest short of enjoying fully the faith once delivered to the saints!

My mother, now 82 years old, having lived in England during the reformation under the ministry of John Wesley and others, and heard them preach, was made a subject of grace; and now half a century has elapsed, she has embraced the primitive faith and practice more perfectly. She was recently baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. My wife, also, who has been among the Methodists 23 years, has submitted to the government of the great King, and has put him on by baptism. Blessed be the name of the Lord! I rejoice in the truth, and feel that I am the Lord's free man.

JOHN P. VAUGHAN.

Maury County, Ten. December 15, 1832.

I WILL first inform you that the little flock in this settlement, invidiously denominated *heretics*; but properly *the disciples of Jesus*, are in sound health. Although their number has not rapidly increased, yet they are living in perfect peace. Now and then one makes the inquiry, "What shall I do?" Peter's answer is in the mouth of every reformer. Obedience to his directions has seldom failed of producing the desired effect—peace of mind. I cannot forbear remarking that an elderly lady, who had been a member of the Presbyterian church 50 years in Ireland and America, observed not long after her immersion, on the subject of remission, that 'whether water washed away sins or not, she did not pretend to say; but since she had obeyed the Lord she enjoyed that peace of mind to which all her lifetime she had been a stranger; that in her moments of distress she had applied to the dead and the living for direction, but not one could give the direction of the Apostles, which she no sooner heard than she obeyed, and found that salvation which she so long earnestly sought.' This woman is intelligent and happy, and an active member of society.

JAMES N. BROWN.

Syracuse, N. Y. December 30, 1832.

I HAVE said nothing of the progress of reform in this vicinity, presuming you will have heard before this from brethren Hayden and Moss, who can doubtless give a more correct account than I can, though their visit was short. We hope to see them again in the Spring. Unfortunately I live at a distance of about 30 miles from a congregation of disciples, and cannot meet with them often. I have no reason to complain. I had rather live alone under the ancient

gospel, than in fellowship with multitudes under any sectarian system. When first arraigned as a heretic, I knew nothing of those brethren who have since associated themselves together in the adjoining counties; nor did I anticipate more than sympathy, *at the time*, from the brethren and sisters in the church; but some of them went with me, and there was a prospect of many more being convinced of the true state of things: but the sudden death of the Elder who had managed the whole affair, sanctified his measures to some and neutralized them to others. Elder Thomson, then settled in Cicero, a town in this county, attended a council called by this church, which induced him to inquire, "What is C——ism?" The consequence was, he became a subscriber for the Millennial Harbinger, was dismissed from his congregation, and I understand those persons most forward to condemn him are now as "heretical" as he, and that many subscribers are found among them, and also that his place is supplied by another as heterodox as any of them, and he is propagating his sentiments in another place. Thus error always defeats itself.

As another specimen of the signs of the times, I will give an extract from the Minutes of the Onondaga county Association for 1832:—

"*Resolved*, That whereas reports are in circulation that the Victory Church have by vote abandoned their articles of faith and covenant, to which they professedly adhered when they united with us, thereby giving reasons to suspect that they have departed from the faith; that a committee be sent to visit said church, and inquire into said reports.

"Appointed brethren ——— to visit V. C. Com. to meet, &c. on the second Wednesday in Jan. next, and report at the next session of this body."

That grace, mercy, and peace may attend you and all the advocates of the ancient gospel, is the fervent prayer of yours in the *one* faith!

W. ANN LATHROP.

[The Lord bless all who love his kingdom and appearing!]—ED.

Philalethes to A. B. G.

Dear Sir—IN a letter so short as that of A. B. G. published in the last number of your Harbinger, I have seldom seen so much of something which I forbear to name. The author asks to be pointed to the place in sacred writ, which records the fact, that Adam was made in the image of God. If the gentleman will look at the 27th verse of the 1st chapter of Genesis, he will find the fact asserted and recorded in express terms. And for scriptural evidence that man is an immortal being, he is referred to Rom. 2: 7. 1 Cor. 15. 53. 2 Tim. 1: 10. where the immortality of the human being is asserted expressly; and to 1st Thess. 4: 17. 2 Thess. 1: 9. 2: 16. 1 John 5: 11, 43, and other passages innumerable, where man's immortality is affirmed by an implication, yielding a certainty not inferior to express words. For how can that which exists not, be forever with the Lord, or suffer everlasting punishment, or enjoy everlasting consolation, or become the recipient of eternal life? But, without doubt, the immortality which be-

longs to God is in many respects very different from that which belongs to man; particularly in this, that it constitutes an attribute of his nature, and is indestructible; whereas the immortality of a creature, being but a gift of the Creator, must, as to its nature, rest on his will for its duration, and of course be liable to be withdrawn or destroyed. There is, then, a sense in which God alone can be said to have immortality, and a sense in which a creature may also possess it.

Here, putting his cobweb wheel in operation, the author gives us some rare productions. He tells us that Christ, *after* his resurrection, was immortal; plainly implying that anterior to that event nothing immortal appertained to him. But what sort of mortality belonged to his divine nature, and to that most precious thing, which, when his animal frame was just becoming an unsuitable habitation for it, he so feelingly consigned to the care of his heavenly father, Philalethes is unable even to conjecture. That Adam's body and the bodies of his progeny have been hitherto mortal, is a fact which all admit; but does it follow, that because their bodies have been and still are mortal, that there is nothing immortal belonging to them? Surely not. For scripture assures us that something, at least, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, continued to live after their bodies were long reduced to dust; and certainly Paul expected that something belonging to him would continue to live after his body should pass into the same condition.

The author tells us that Christ *was* the image of God, and he alone. And we admit that Christ not only *was*, but still continues to be the image of God, in a sense in which no mere creature ever was or can be, he being the effulgence of his Father's glory and the exact image of his substance, so perfectly exact, that with truth it could be predicated of him, that he who has seen me has seen the Father—I and my Father are one. But though Christ possesses a universal pre-eminence, of which the ineffable exactness of his likeness to his Father constitutes a distinguished part, it does not follow that merely human creatures do possess a fainter resemblance; and scripture positively asserts that at least Adam did; and if he did, it was certainly a mental and not a corporeal similitude which he bore to God.

He further informs us, *that we infer*, (but on what authority beside his own fancy he has neglected to tell us,) that Adam's body was made in imitation of Christ's body; that is, in imitation of a model, which had then no existence, nor for 4000 years afterwards. This is truly tough, hard doctrine. Who can understand it? It so, however, happens that Scripture tells us just the reverse—that Christ's body was made in imitation of Adam's body, or at least of a human body. For he took the form of a bondman, was born in the likeness of men, and fashioned as a man; in short, he assumed our nature and condescended to appear in a body formed in exact imitation of Adam's body; and this most marvellous stoop constituted no small part of his humiliation.

When Philalethes asserted the similitude of man to his Maker, certainly it will not be supposed that he meant a corporeal resemblance; for that would ascribe to God a body like our own; but a mental re-

semblance, consisting in intellection and endless duration; the one rendered certain to us by experience or consciousness; the other, by the testimony of sacred writ, which has brought the knowledge of life and immortality into our benighted world.

Had, then, Philalethes no other cause than what appears in A.B.G's short letter* to glory in his contention for the Scriptures, the whole Scriptures, and nothing but the Scriptures, he presumes he would have enough to justify his exultation. How much more, then, when it is absolutely certain that by this contention, successfully prosecuted, alone can mankind be delivered from the pernicious influence of the senseless ill-founded reveries and dreams of self-conceited men, and the nominally Christian world, from the huge mass of impure faith that floats in it like rotten weeds on the pestilential surface of a stagnant lake. Should, therefore, A. B. G. persist in offering more remarks, it is hoped he will render them more worthy of his time, and better calculated to reward the reader's time and labor in perusing them, than those in his letter. PHILALETHES.

P. S.—Your last Harbinger came not to hand till Saturday last. When, however, it arrived, it brought abundant compensation for its delay. You cannot conceive the delight which I felt on looking at the three or four letters of my venerable preceptor, the learned, modest, good, and most amiable Dr. *Beattie*. I am more indebted to these two remarkable men, *Beattie* and *Campbell*, than to all the world beside. It was under their instruction and example that I first contracted an aversion to bigotry, and a contempt for bigots of all sorts. Had it not been for their counsel, I would, no doubt, have lived a mean slave to great names all my days. Until I read it in your preface to these letters, I was quite ignorant of the fact that any of Dr. Beattie's were ever published. I should be glad to get a copy of them. P

Notice and Apology.

ALTHOUGH I have deferred several pieces in our regular series to make room for our correspondents, we have been unable to publish the one half of the communications forwarded, deserving a place in this work. The crisis in Virginia demands special attention. The posture of affairs in Eastern Virginia, relative to reformation, is rather somewhat extraordinary. Nothing but the press of business in our office, prevents our issuing a few *Extras* for Virginia on Virginia affairs. Who could have believed, a few years ago, that certain good, and mild, and liberal-minded leaders among the Baptists, could have been compelled to the singular alternative of making it a crime deserving of censure, to read this periodical! Was there ever a victory in argument so unequivocally conceded by the vanquished as this? It is now admitted if our writings are read the cause we plead cannot be resisted. Gentlemen, you cannot long retain a dominion over the faith of those who have any conscience which requires your admirers to shut both their eyes and their ears. Communications on hand, of importance, bearing upon the times, shall appear as soon as we can find room for them. EDITOR.

*Particularly in his inference drawn from the first part of Genesis.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Number IV.——Volume IV.

Bethany, Va. April, 1833.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'Corkle,—*a Layman.*

(*Continued.*)

THE SIX SEALS.

WE purpose examining some of the most prominent predictions which are standing unfulfilled—those in the portentous future. Predictions which are past we look at as we view the bow of the great Creator on a cloud which is past; but many of those in the future we view as a gathering storm, rising in dark majesty; charged with thunder, strong with tempest, and stretching widely across our horizon.

With these views, dare I be silent? Believing thus, may I, through fear of blundering, hold my peace? What kind of an excuse will this be when summoned before the tribunal of the King of kings? How much will a little blunder weigh in the scale of omnipotence—how much, compared to the plaudit of the Master, "Well done good and faithful servant"? If I can but rouse in some few individuals the spirit of investigation in the examination of these matters, I shall not lose my reward. I despair of being generally useful; or of being

impartially heard by very many. Trite repetitions, or the want of method will be pardoned by those who will candidly examine these matters for themselves. A large part of christendom will not believe though one should rise from the dead.

The most alarming and the most misapplied prophecies in the whole Bible, may be found, Revelation chapter sixth, from the twelfth verse to the end. Our priests, almost universally, quote the prophecy as a portrait of the final day: never dreaming that it is to have its special accomplishment on themselves. The passage cannot be applied to the final judgment without involving the rudest absurdities and inconsistencies.

First, this sixth seal, if thus applied, must be prematurely introduced, and inspiration must have made a blunder by transposing the seals—for the seventh evidently relates to this world again. Prayers of the saints, a censer, incense, fire cast into the earth, voices, thunderings and lightnings, and an earthquake; all this after the dissolution of nature under the sixth seal! Now who is to be saddled with this blunder? Inspiration, or the "specially called and sent" embassadors!

A second most insuperable difficulty presents itself in the following: "And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth." The passage plainly implies number, many—"As a fig tree casteth her untimely figs when shaken of a mighty wind." Ask the astronomer how many stars, in the common acceptation, can fall to this earth, many of them larger than our world, and most likely would fall to the sun, if there was any thing like up or down with them. Now if our divines do not misapply God's word, it must clash rudely with the laws of nature. They call the Apocalypse a book of metaphors, yet apply it literally. "And the heavens departed as a scroll when it is rolled together." The passage, if applied literally, takes into its range, a ruin without limit, without parallel, and, with due respect to the opinions of others, without foundation in God's word, which would be but a blot on the face of Deity, and which God, to speak with reverence, can have no pretext for consummating. Is Omnipotence, with a single sweep, to obliterate the innumerable suns and systems which glow and sparkle throughout immensity of space, just for the purpose of giving intelligences a specimen of destroying power! Now, reader, can your imagination grasp the extent of space? Infinity presents itself at once, glowing with suns innumerable, stars in the crown of Deity, lamps illuminating the great house of Omnipotence, pouring light and heat on their numerous worlds and systems revolving round them—multiplied myriads of intelligences inhabiting and animating the immense whole. Think that at some destined hour, the power, who bade these things be, and they existed, who said, "*Let there be light*, and there was light," is to stretch over his works the "line of confusion;" blot out those living fires which glow with undiminished lustre in his diadem; leave a solitary waste; depopulate space—a destroying God "o'er ghastly ruin, frowning from his throne!" Is his throne to stand unshaken? Where is Omnipotence to plant his *hitherto* to the ruin he has decreed? The heavens are involved in the universal wreck. And if one single

star is involved in this prophecy, all are. The idea of applying this prediction literally, began and is continued in the most palpable ignorance of the Bible. "And every mountain and island were moved out of their places." For what offence are the literal mountains and islands to suffer these convulsions? Are they to sustain the mighty wreck, and the balance of the globe to remain unhurt. But this difficulty will be solved, as the others are, by saying, We will understand them when they are past. Some of the learned have racked their invention to find out that "heathen temples and their precincts," and "seaport towns and fortified places" were alluded to in the phrase "mountains and islands." But we cannot look for much better when men attempt to explain things they do not understand.

I have shown three or four difficulties in this one prophecy, which cannot be solved if the present system of teaching be true. I am not invalidating the law or the prophets, but the wretched system of exposition which is gulling the word into ruin. If our teachers have mistaken the meaning of this prophecy, why not others—why not all—aye, and the precepts too? If they are mistaken in this, is it not some evidence that they understand none? for the key which unlocks the one will unlock the whole. And these blunders will terminate as did those of the Jewish rabbies.

If the alarming passage under consideration cannot be applied to the close of time without barefaced inconsistencies, where will we find a legitimate object? When the God of truth uses such language, what kind of events must we expect—when and where are they to have their accomplishment? Reader, if you believe your Bible, can you rest while these questions remain unanswered? On whose comment are you willing to risk your all, your seat at the marriage supper of the Lamb, when the eternal God will let the world know again that the judge of all the earth will do right?

But to understand the Apostle's meaning in this sixth seal, we must take the seals in connexion. I offer my opinion—let not man trust to man—"To the law and to the testimony." If I speak not according to it, it is because there is no light in me.

The Apocalypse is a history of the church. The seven seals may properly be considered the platform of that history, embracing seven great items. The first item shows the introduction of christianity, under the figure of a white horse. The second shows the persecutions which followed—a red horse. The third shows Christianity estab-ished by civil authority—a black horse. The balances represent the spiritual laws, church tests, creeds, standards, &c. The fourth, under a figure of a pale horse, shows the church corrupt, sickly, pale, death and hell following; the natural consequence of church establishment. The fifth shows the consequence of corruption—the church lifts the sword of persecution herself—slaughters the saints. This seal probably embraces the whole reign of antichrist, which, according to the best calculations we can make, will close about the year 1847. This is a very short, and positively a true history of the church, thus far

The sixth seal presents the last dreadful item in the history of the dispensation committed to the Gentiles. This closes and perfects the analogy between the Jewish and the Gentile churches. I have already shown that churches or dispensations never renovate after becoming corrupt—have shown that two dispensations have fallen on account of corruption—that the present is following, in close step, the fate of the former, for the same cause—that we cannot expect a better fate while the same holy unchangeable God holds the destinies of dispensations or empires in his hands. I have also shown that the commonly received opinions respecting the meaning of this sixth seal, is absurd or inadmissible. I now propose giving the legitimate and natural meaning of the sixth seal, and I invite scrutiny on the subject; for I will always exchange an error for truth.

First, I will offer a few remarks on the word "heaven." No word in the Bible more misapplied. Throughout the Apocalypse the word may be or should be applied to the church, with but few exceptions. Most Divines will admit this until it involves them in difficulties or their churches in ruin. The Bible is the best interpreter of the Bible, and the words of the Master should silence all cavils:—"From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Many passages of the like import might be quoted. To Peter Christ said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." This cannot relate to the invisible world. And the very climax of Catholic ignorance and absurdities is to give Peter and his successors jurisdiction in another world—in another state of existence.

We must unavoidably apply the term *heaven* to the church, or admit things that common sense would revolt at. For the Master farther saith, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Our scrap-mongers and Doctors (except the Catholic) apply, and justly too, this text to the gospel heavens: yet when these very *heavens* are to be rolled together as a scroll, they will transfer the application to the celestial world—teach things a full match for that of giving Peter the plenitude of power ascribed to him by the Roman church. But to return: A key is an emblem of government. Peter did open the door into the kingdom of heaven, or the Christian dispensation. See Acts, chap. ii.

We have at least an indubitable warrant for applying the term *heaven* to the church, and to go into the Revelation without this application of the term, we will find little else than a rude bundle of inconsistencies—See Revelation iii. "And I saw a star fall from *heaven* unto the earth, and to *him* was given the key of the bottomless pit." To *him*, (the star) an active agent, was given the key, or government of the bottomless pit.

Some conspicuous character in the church fell from *heaven*, the purity of the gospel, and to *him* was given the government of the Catholic church. "He that runs may read." See also, Rev. xii. "And there appeared a great wonder in *heaven:* a woman, clothed

with the sun, &c. and there was war in *heaven*. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels." The word *heaven*, in this passage, cannot relate to any thing beyond the limits of our globe. An object to which we can apply the figure of the woman, can be found no where else. The woman was persecuted on earth, let her place of residence be where it may. "And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the *earth*, he persecuted the woman." "And the earth helped the woman." Remember, this woman appeared in heaven, and the dragon made war in heaven.—Who will say this woman, and the persecution too, related to any thing but the church? The woman fled into the wilderness—Is there a wilderness in the heaven above? Among the rudest absurdities ever palmed on the credulity of the world, is the transfer of this war to the worlds above. It is the production of a poetical imagination, the merest fiction, dressed up in all the beauties and strength of language, spiced by learning, and made savory by the most imposing decorations; surcharged with heathen mythology, sanctified by universal applause, and handed to the world for the meaning of this war in heaven.* I will quote another passage where the word *heaven* must relate to scenes which are to be transacted on earth. Rev. xix. "And the armies in *heaven* followed him on white horses." "And he treadeth the wine press of the fierceness and wrath of almighty God." Now, reader, enquire where the wine press is to be trodden—ascertain this fact, and you will find out where the *heaven* is, which is so often alluded to in the Apocalypse. A fatal time, a fatal place, and some fatal spell have so stupified priests and people, that the most perfect security reigns. The spirit of slumber has locked up the senses, precluding investigation—None enquiring where or when these things are to take place—when the dreadful drama is to be brought upon the stage.

I will now take the prophecy contained in the sixth seal. I have shown that the word *heaven* uniformly relates to the church, in the Revelation; and that the heaven which is to be rolled together as a scroll relates to it, and perfectly corresponds with the former seals and with the former dealings of the unchangeable God towards corrupt churches. To apply the term *heaven* indiscriminately to the church or to the world above, as best suits our purposes, is well calculated to produce the most fatal blunders. The heaven from whence the star fell, in which the woman appeared, in which the war was waged, and in which the winepress is to be trodden, is certainly the church. And the heaven which is to be rolled together as a scroll, and all the alarming metaphors coupled with it, indubitably related to the present church.

"And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal; and lo! there was a great earthquake," [political and ecclesiastical convulsions;] "and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became

*"Milton's Paradise Lost," for poetical merit, will rarely be equalled; for palpable absurdities, will never be surpassed. It is a libel on the Paradise of God.

as blood," [a dread eclipse of the gospel heavens;] "and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth," [church luminaries;] "and the heaven" [the church] "departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places," [governments and petty divisions moved out of their places. A mountain is a figure of a government; as, "The Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains."] The whole seal, taken together, is a most impressive description of the last dreadful catastrophe which is to close the present dispensation: the consternation which is to seize our great men and nobles in the church—those who have been gulling and blinding us, as well as those who have been gulled and blinded: one common fate, one common wreck of the church and all its appendages.

That these opinions should have a dangerous or demoralizing effect on a single individual on earth, is utterly impossible. Will a good man relax his exertions to promote the cause of the Master, because he sees the day approaching? He will rather double his diligence. Who, in the midst of the battle, will sit down calmly, with folded arms? Who would not relax his otherwise invincible hold on party names, creeds, and distinctions, if he believed that the Lord, for the controversy of Zion and the corruption of the church, would soon "render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire, and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh: and the slain of the Lord shall be many." Isa. lvi. But the spiritualizers of the day can turn this into a spiritual flame, a spiritual sword, and a spiritual slaughter, when the time for the mighty outpourings of the *Spirit* takes place! Happy riddance, happy transformation of the most pointed threatening and alarm into messages of peace and good will!

With the sixth seal I will couple Isaiah xxxiv. The passages are near akin, and must have the same object in view: "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree; for my sword shall be bathed in heaven." The Prophet then takes the animal creation for a figure, the strong as well as the weak—"the great men and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond man." And the terms Bozrah and Idumea may properly be considered figurative; for they are significant of trouble and bloodshed, and may relate to the downfall of antichrist. [See Bishop Scott's comment on Isa. xxxiv.] "For the land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion." Here is a reason given: In Christian Zion what else but controversy can be found? And couple this with the treading of the wine press. But our peace-preaching Divines will apply this to the destruction of Jerusalem; and if driven from this, they will find a safe and happy application of this and every other alarming word and metaphor in the Bible, to the dissolution of the material world. But how will they

reconcile the following part of the prophecy to the sack of Jerusalem: "The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch." And with as little propriety can it be applied to the dissolution of nature. "It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever: but the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl and the raven shall dwell in it," &c. "Thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof: and it shall be a habitation for dragons, and a court for owls." Can this take place after nature's dissolution? Can it apply to the destruction of Jerusalem? If not, in the name of Reason where or when is it to have its accomplishment? What fatal spot on earth is to be the theatre of these tremendous judgments? It well becomes our peace-predicting watchmen to show that the prophecy has been fulfilled, or that it does not relate to our world, or that we may safely wait a hundred or two years before these questions need be agitated.

Now it is an unquestionable fact, that sore and heavy judgments have always overtaken men unawares, when most corrupt, and least prepared. And the judgments which are hanging over christendom, are to come as a "thief in the night." "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be at the coming of the Son of Man. They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage," &c. The present generation perfectly suits the description, exceeds the past, surpasses any thing known before—for ambition, avarice, enterprize, speculation, intrigue, corruption, crime, "hatred, variance, emulation, strife, sedition, heresies," wars, religious as well as political; priest and people equally bitten with a rage for riches—uniting the happy art of serving God and Mammon too—men running to and fro, and knowledge increasing—iniquity abounding, and the love of many waxing cold. These are "*signs of the times;*" and come the day when it may, it will find the world in the very situation it now is in—unprepared, filled with discord and war. Why unprepared? Because the watchmen will be sunk in deep sleep, or crying, Peace and safety! when sudden destruction cometh.

God forbid that I should indiscriminately apply Isa. lxvi. 10, 11, and 12 to them. There are some honorable exceptions; but lamentable fact is this: the Prophet drew too plain a portrait of the present, while the former priests sat for the picture.

It seems that almost the whole of the prophecies have one concentrating point—the dissolution of the present administration, and the introduction of Christ's universal reign. The old Prophet, after foretelling some unexampled calamity, in the most impressive language, breaks out into a description of Christ's universal reign. In his emphatic way of expression, "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them! and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose!"

We shall next hear the testimony of Daniel about these things. He, after describing four empires which were to succeed each other, points by the finger of inspiration to a little horn, or dominion, which was to rise in the fourth, the Roman. In this empire, in its metropolis, rose an ecclesiastic authority, exactly suiting the description. And this horn, or authority, according to prophecy, was to make war on the saints until the Ancient of Days should come.

Now it is a fact quite notorious, that the Catholic church has made war entirely on the saints. There may be a few solitary exceptions. The victims which have fallen by this devoted Mother of Harlots have been the most pious, humble, devotional ones of the earth; not for immorality of conduct, but for wrong faith—for believing contrary to the spiritual laws of that church. Mystical Babylon has followed the steps of ancient Babylon—has resorted to fire, as the most powerful argument to produce conformity, or unity of faith. It cannot be the Christian religion that shows no mercy, whose vengeance knows no parallel this side of hell. There is no tribunal on earth that carries such terror, such petrifying dismay with it, as the Inquisition—none other that brings such an association of dreadful ideas. The Inquisition may not be in full force at the present day; but the very sound is like a death-bell toll.

I would ask, by what authority has it been abolished? Who has opened the prison doors, unlocked its dungeons, broken its chains, rendered harmless its racks and engines of torture, or quenched its fires? Has the church in mercy interposed, or the clergy entered a protest against the effusion of human blood? or has the "earth helped the woman?"—to wit: civil authority, men of the world, put a stop to clerical tyranny—to the inhuman conduct of those who profess to be the embassadors of the merciful Saviour of sinners? And this very church, famous for violating every precept of the gospel—famous for its many prayers to Peter and others—famous for murders and debaucheries of every kind, has transmitted to us the precious boon of ordination, succession of authority, &c. and according to the commonly received opinions of the day—aye, this "Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth" is to be restored to primitive Christian excellence! A vast majority of Christendom, bound, fettered to this ungodly religion—whose spiritual laws preclude investigation—bigotry, armed with the strength of nations, guarding against the possibility of change. Demonstration, the power of raising the dead, healing the sick, opening the eyes of the blind, could produce but a partial reformation in the Catholic church—about as much as these very things did in the Jewish.

Now, is the church to remain a blot in the face of creation, when the universal reign of Christ commences—or is she to be blotted out? Is she to be reinstated to favor, after martyring millions of Christ's followers, and making war on the saints—or is she to be made a monument of divine displeasure? No doubt in my mind, but the very city Rome is to be destroyed by an earthquake or a volcanic eruption. The fate of Sodom and Gomorrah awaits her. "And the streams

thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch; it shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever and ever." Isa. xxxiv.

[*To be continued.*]

TRINITARIANISM, ARIANISM, & SOCINIANISM.

FOR THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Dear Brother Campbell:

THERE are several of your readers, besides myself, in this vicinity, who respectfully solicit, for the truth's sake, and our fellowship in the same, a brief, but definite explanation of your remarks in the last Harbinger, page 9, on the nature of our blessed Lord. Whether it is to be attributed to obtuseness of understanding on our part, or to indefiniteness of statement on yours, the fact is, beloved, that from the closest attention we are capable of giving to all you have written on this subject, we do not yet understand you.

We are equally opposed with you to "Trinitarian, Arian, and Unitarian speculations on the *divine essence*." From the systems of fallible and erring men, we trust the Son has made us free. Our desire is, simply to understand what the Spirit of truth teaches on this and every other subject.

Most cordially do we unite with you in acknowledging the Messiah as "a divine person, the only begotten of God." Most devoutly would we love, "worship and adore him" AS "*the only begotten of the Father*, full of favor and truth." But we tremble at the word of HIM who will not give his glory to another, and we obey that word which teaches us to love and worship the Son "*to the glory of God the Father.*"

Will you favor us with a definite answer to the following queries?

1. Who is the One God, besides whom there is none else—who is to be acknowledged, loved, adored and worshipped as the eternal, unbegotten, independent ALL IN ALL, OF whom are all things?

If you reply, in the words which the Holy Spirit teaches, 1 Cor. viii. 6, "*the Father*," we ask—

2. Do you, in the term Father, used in the above sense as "the one God," *include*, or *exclude* the only begotten of the Father, who was with him "before the world was"?

3. Do you, or do you not, understand the terms first, only begotten Son, beginning of the creation of God, first born of every creature, "in the full import and meaning of (these) words," as we do, VIZ: as teaching, that the Son, in his highest personal nature, is a distinct being from the Father, and had a "beginning" of existence?

4. Do you understand our Lord's words, "My Father is greater than I," in a *limited*, or *unlimited* sense? Do you understand him to affirm this without any reservation? When the Son, or Word, was with the Father, before he came down from heaven, was he, or was he not, as *independently* wise, powerful, self-existent and eternal, as the Father?

5. Do you, or do you not, make a distinction in the worship you ofler the Father and the Son? Do you not worship the Son as the *begotten* of the Father? Do you not worship the Father as *unbegotten?* Do you not worship him as the one God, or whom are all things; who, by his own infinite, underived wisdom, power, and goodness, creates, upholds, saves, and judges? Do you *thus* worship the Son, *also?* or do you worship him as the one Lord BY whom are all things, *by* whom God made the worlds, *by* whom he saves, and *by* whom he will judge us? Do you not worship the Son *to the glory of the Father*, and the Father to his own independent glory?

I am aware that an answer to some of these questions will necessarily involve an answer to others; but I have thus presented the subject, that we may, by a singleness of eye to truth and the favor of our Lord, obtain an understanding of what is written in our Father's book concerning his best beloved, and that believing we may have life through his name.

I have too much confidence in your kindness and candor to think that you will decline publishing this communication; nor can I imagine that you will excuse yourself from giving a definite answer (which many, for the truth's sake, are wishing to hear) with the plea that we have presented to your vain speculations. It will not be denied that Jesus Christ is the one God of whom are all things, or he is not. Nor can it be denied that it is important for us to know whether he is so or not, that we may worship with understanding and in truth.

Yours in the good hope through favor,

HENRY GREW.

Hartford, Conn. February 6, 1833.

TO BROTHER HENRY GREW.

Dear Sir:

WITH that promptitude and candor due to yourself and those of my readers whom you represent, I proceed to answer the questions which you have so affectionately and respectfully propounded to my consideration.

Averse to all speculations which can have no practical influence on the hearts or behavior of men, the only reluctance which I could feel in replying to some of these interrogatories is their apparent propinquity to the high and cold latitudes of metaphysical theology. In our ascent to these high and cold regions of abstract speculation, it is no easy matter to keep the mercury from freezing. I will, however, attempt to give them as practical an aspect as the off-hand and desultory thoughts of an hour snatched from other pressing subjects of examination will afford.

Before replying to your queries in the form of direct answers, I would request your attention to the following preliminary reflections. These considerations will, indeed, explain some of the reasons which influence the answers which I may tender, and therefore I would urge the necessity of giving them due attention.

The modus of the Divine existence, as well as the modus of the Divine operations in creation, providence, and redemption, is, to our finite minds, the creatures of yesterday, wholly inscrutable and incomprehensible. On both, the Bible is silent. Becomes it us, then, to be dogmatical on such a theme, or to stretch our inquiries beyond the *terra firma* of revelation?

My principal objection to the popular doctrine of "the Trinity" is not that it is either irrational, or unscriptural, to infer that there are three Divine persons in one Divine nature. That these three equally have one thought, purpose, will, and operation, and so one God;—or, to use the words of the Westminster Confession, "In the Unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity;" I say, I object not to this doctrine because it is contrary to reason, or revelation, but because of the metaphysical technicalities, the unintelligible jargon, the unmeaning language of the orthodox creeds on this subject, and the interminable war of words without ideas to which this word *Trinity* has given birth. For example, in the same section from which I have quoted the above words is found the following jargon: "The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

Were any one to ask me, Can there be three distinct persons, or even beings, in one God? I would say, Reason informs me not, and revelation does not assert it. But if asked, Can three be one, and one three in the same sense? I reply, Both reason and revelation say No. But then no Trinitarian or Calvinist affirms that the three are one, and the one three, in the same sense.

Language fails and thought cannot reach the relation in which the Father and the Son have existed, now exist, and shall forever exist. *But that there is, and was, and evermore will be, society in God himself, a plurality as well as unity in the Divine nature,* are inferences which do obtrude themselves on my mind in reflecting upon the divine communications to our race. I will add, that common sense, reason, and revelation, give one and the same testimony, in my ear, upon this subject.

If you ask me *how* this can be, I will ask you, *How* can there be one self-existent, independent, unoriginated, eternal God? You will say, I believe, but cannot comprehend. So say I. But while our faith has in its first effort to encounter a truth so incomprehensible, and to receive it; a truth so mysterious, supernatural, unsearchable, transcendent; a truth which, in its stupendous dimensions, encompasses infinite space, an eternity past—the universe, natural, intellectual, moral; a truth which leaves out no existence, past, present, or future; which overwhelms every intellect, and sets at defiance the combined efforts of all created intelligence:—I repeat it, since this must be the Alpha of our faith, where shall we place our Omega, on the mode of the Divine existence? He that comes to God, must first believe THAT HE IS.

But I am not more confounded than delighted with the idea of the One, Self-existent, and Eternal God. To me, its incomprehensibility is a source of joy. With exultation I ask, "Who by searching can find out God, or know the Almighty to perfection?" My child says, Who made God? and, methinks, I am no wiser in the estimation of my superiors.

But, sir, the Alpha and the Omega of all the scholastic strifes about trinity, and all the questions agitated for fifteen centuries on the mode of Divine existence, appear to me to spring from one source. None appears to me to have noticed, with sufficient attention, that there is *but one word in the language of mortals which is absolute and irrelative.* If angels have a language, although I am in perfect ignorance of their stipulated signs, one thing I can affirm, that they too have but one word in their language which is not relative.

All the names of God are, with the exception of this one, the names of relations. God, Almighty, Lord, Creator, Father, King, Governor, Judge—infinite, omniscient, eternal, &c. If no Satan, there could be no God; if no mighty, no Almighty; if no dominion, no Lord; if no creation, no Creator; if no Son, no Father; if no subjects, no King, &c. But what sublimity, what unspeakable meaning, in the address to Moses, Ex. vi. 2, 3: "And God said to Moses, I am Jehovah. I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them." I AM knows no relation to any creature, or being; to past, present, or future; to time or to eternity. It is equivalent to *I exist*, a name which cannot be given to any being which by nature is not God, or self-existent.

I repeat it, I am not more bewildered than delighted, in the idea of the incomprehensibility of the name JEHOVAH. And while this name is before us, let me ask the wavering to reflect, how man could be created social, and in the image of God; man, having in his nature plurality, incomplete in one person; for man is not without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in nature or religion. I ask, How could man be created in the image of God, incomplete in one person, social, and necessarily plural; and that God, in whose image and likeness he was created, could be a solitary eternal unit, without society and plurality in himself! This I cannot comprehend, when I believe that God said, "Let *us* make man in *our* image, in *our* likeness, and let him have dominion"; and, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

While, then, I do most cordially repudiate the whole scholastic phraseology of the Trinitarian, Arian, and Socinian speculations, I do not, with some Trinitarians, regard my Lord Messiah as having always been an eternal Son; nor can I, with the Arian, view him as some super-angelic creature, filling an immense chasm between Jehovah and the supernal hosts; and still less can I degrade him, with the Socinian, to the rank of a mere man, the son of Joseph. Common sense, reason, and revelation, put their veto on such hypotheses. No: my Lord and Saviour is no creature, nor the son of a creature. In

the beginning he was THE WORD OF GOD, is now the Son of God, and will, when government is no longer necessary, be again recognized as the *Word of God*, "a name which no man knows, but he himself."*

I must be born again, and be endowed with other reasoning powers, and have another revelation, before I can become an Arian. I will give you one reason out of a hundred, and but one, because I feel that it alone, if I had not another, would forever preclude the hypothesis: it is, in one sentence, Because the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly.

If I am asked to explain how this can be, I refuse not. The Arian toils and sweats, and taxes his ingenuity to show what a glorious creature the Son of God was in his pre-existent state. He fancies and represents the Son as filling some intermediate rank more than midway between the Arch Seraphim and the Deity. He thinks he devoutly consults the honor of the Son, when he finds for him some vacant throne, nearest to the Self-existent and Eternal, beyond the aspirations of the cherubim and seraphim. There he places him, a sort of sub-deity, whence he descends to become incarnate. Yet, strange to tell, when this first and high-born One, of unrivalled glory amongst the creatures of God, appears in human flesh, *he gives him nothing to do, which the son of Joseph could not have done as well!!!* Was ever folly more consummate! What is folly, but the adoption of inadequate means to ends? Is it not folly to give a diamond for a straw?—to raise a tempest to move a feather?—to discharge the artillery of heaven against a worm?—to hurl the thunderbolts of Omnipotence against a fly?—to despatch the Arch Angel on an errand which the son of Joseph could have as well performed?

What creature could do more than Abel, Moses, John the Baptist, Stephen, Peter, James the just, or Paul did—tell the truth, the whole truth, lead an exemplary life, and as a martyr offer up his soul to God!†

---

* See some thoughts on *the Word of God*, C. B. vol. 4, p. 230.

†We cannot give our reasons *in extenso* for any of the more important conclusions suggested in these remarks. On this point we shall offer one. In our judgment it matters not whether we regard the sacrifice of Christ as a mere display of love, or as a sin-offering, that God might be just in justifying him that believeth. On either hypothesis, the Arian or Socinian system is wholly at fault. For should we, with the Arian, imagine that Jesus, as to his pre-existent state, was a creature, however exalted, it avails nothing; because the distance between any creature and his Creator is so immense (infinite I was going to say,) that all the creation might stand between, and yet no nearer approach to Deity. Now if Jesus never was, as to his celestial origin, more than a creature, he could, as a sin-offering, effect nothing more than any other creature: his life and death were all due to his Creator on his own account. Gabriel never can do more than his own duty. But on the other hypothesis, that his death was a mere display of love, in what, let me ask, does this love consist? To Omnipotence and Omniscience the creation of any one creature is as easy as another. It required no more or greater effort on the part of the *Almighty* to create Gabriel than an eagle—this most illustrious creature than a sparrow. And how would the text read, "God so loved the world that he gave

What, let me again ask, is folly, if this be not folly? To waste resources, or squander means, is as foolish as not to provide them. He who provides the materials for a palace, and builds a cottage, is as very a simpleton as he who attempts to build a palace out of the materials of a tent. Could not Gabriel, who waited on Daniel on the banks of Ulai; nay, could not Paul himself, do as much for the redemption of the world, as the Arian Son of God? When some philosopher appears, who with a dash of his pen can blot out sin, or show me that the tears of the penitent, or the blood of bulls and goats can wash it from the universe, then, but not till then, will I turn Arian.

For the same, or a similar reason, I cannot be a *Socinian.* This is but a new edition of the fable—the mountain in labor, and a mouse is born. Heaven taught sages; legislators, kings, prophets, priests, and seers, for four thousand years, filled with the spirit of wisdom and revelation, exhaust all the similitudes, analogies, and imagery of this creation; impoverish the eloquence of heaven and earth, all figures and forms of speech, to raise the expectations of mankind in anticipation of a wonderful child, on whose shoulders the government of the universe was to remain, whose name was written' "Wonderful Counsellor—the Mighty God—the Father of Eternity—the Prince of Peace—Immanuel": yet when the prediction is accomplished, Mary travails, and the carpenter's son is born—a Son of God, it is true, as Adam was!!!

With me, consistency must precede faith. I must see types, figures, prophecies, promises, harmonizing; I must see the means and the end correspondent; I must see wisdom, power, goodness; justice, mercy, love; condescension, truth, and holiness, shining in all the splendors of Divinity, before I can subscribe to any proposition touching the personal dignity and standing of my Lord the King.

It will not suffice to puzzle me with hard questions about how this can be, since my faith has in its infancy to master the master truth of revelation—to admit that God is *Jehovah;* or, that God was, and always is, the self-existent, immutable and eternal, never-began-to-be, the eternal inhabitant of eternity. Believing this, I find no difficulty in believing that there was, and is, and evermore shall be, society and plurality—a literal *I,* and *thou,* and *he*—a *we,* and *our,* and *us,* in *one divine nature.* This to me is as easy as the idea of SELF-EXISTENT; yea, more easy when *I,* and *thou,* and *he* deliberate on creation, providence, and redemption. I cannot, for my life, even fancy a nature destitute of *I,* and *thou,* and *he.* I am certain it is not the human—I am certain it is not the angelic—certain, too, that it is not the divine.

——— for its redemption"!!! May I not infer, then, that the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly? The Socinian, who calls Jesus *divine,* and some others who call him a *divine* person, because of the gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed on him, might, in their interpretation of the word *divine,* find room for Balaam's ass; because that ass was under such plenary inspiration as to have the words suggested, and to speak with the gift of tongues, when it reproved the madness of the Prophet and preached reformation to him. Assuredly it was, in *their* vocabulary, a *divine* ass!

In our nature there is no more than I, and thou, and he, as respects primary relation. There is no more in the angelic, and the Bible reveals no more than I, and thou, and he in the divine. But not turning aside to answer objections which are anticipated, be it observed that I make not this a matter of inference only; for there is an association of the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the revealed relation of the three persons, I, thou, and he, and just in the dignity of these three. "I send thee," "I and thou send him," "Jehovah and his Spirit has sent me." On this principle the Christian economy is arranged and developed. So I read the volumes of revelation. These reflections premised, I proceed to answer your ingenious questions:—

QUERY 1, ANSWERED.

Jehovah is the one only living and true God. I cannot adopt the answer you suggest, 1 Cor. viii. 6. *for that answers not your question.* Had you propounded the question which Paul had in his eye, then I would have given his answer. It was not the contradistinguishing of the Father and the Son, as respects divinity, which Paul had in view; but the contradistinguishing of the "gods many" and the "lords many" of Paganism, from the one God and one Lord of Christians.

QUERY 2, ANSWERED.

As the phrase "one God," 1 Cor. viii. 6. is not applied to the Father, but in contradistinction from "gods many;" so we cannot say that in contradistinction from the Son or only begotten, that it either includes or excludes; for that was not in the mind of the Apostle when he wrote to the Corinthians. The phrase "Son of God" in the New Testament imports a participation of the divine nature. A little more reflection, and I presume you will perceive how I should err were I to answer your first question in the words of 1 Cor. viii. 6. Were you asked, 'Do you, in calling Jesus the one Lord, include or exclude the Father from the nature and essential attributes of the one Lord,' what would you answer? Would you not say, 'The Father is not excluded; for certainly he is the one absolute Lord: for so the Prophets have named and addressed him a thousand times. But now he has made Jesus Lord. So that in the new economy the Father is our only God, and Jesus is our only Lord.'

QUERY 3, ANSWERED.

The word "*being*," in its full latitude, signifies simple existence; but in its appropriated sense here you mean something more than simple existence. I find the personal pronouns always used in the Holy Scriptures, speaking of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and therefore, if I must use an abstract term, I will use *person* rather than *being*—though I am not much in love with either. The Scriptures no where teach me that the Son in his highest personal nature had a beginning of being or existence; "*the word was in the beginning with God*," even that word "which was made flesh and dwelt among us." "*The word was God;*" and as such, I venerate "the word made flesh," "as God manifest in the flesh."

QUERY 4, ANSWERED.

"My Father is greater than I," I understand in an economical or restricted sense. But it militates not with the dignity of the Son of God, if, in some sense, the Father was always greater than he. The Trinitarians themselves, who make him an eternal Son, fairly concede this; for a Son is, in some sense, inferior to the Father; while, in another sense, he may be superior. But I regard all that was spoken by Jesus of this import as respecting his state of humiliation and its consequences.

QUERY 5, ANSWERED.

In worshipping Jesus I worship him as my Lord and Saviour, as the Son of God, to the glory of the Father. In worshipping the Father, I worship him through the Son; and therefore I honor both the Father and the Son. But, my dear sir, I do not think of worshipping with that exactitude of which you speak, as if I were to pay so much tax to the King and so much tythe to the Priest. I cannot thus mathematically worship either the Father or the Son. The Father and the Son are one in my salvation. The Father is my God, and Jesus is my Lord. They are one in the admiration of my understanding—they are one in the adoration of my heart.

Thus, brother Grew, if compelled to philosophize, I would answer your questions. I own that much depends upon our views of the personal dignity and standing of the Lord Messiah. Indeed, such was the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and such is the glory which he now enjoys as Lord of all in our nature, that I think we are much more likely to fail in forming too low, than too high, conceptions of his essential dignity. The Father has so glorified him as our head, and has so signified to us his delight in him, that, of all the texts in the Bible, there is none we could misapply in reference to Jesus more than that which says, "Jehovah will not give his glory to another." He has laid no restrictions upon the admiration and adoration of the human or angelic hosts in reference to his only begotten Son; nay, all angels and men are commanded to worship him. No idolatry in worshipping the King of glory!! I would not for the universe weaken the force of a single expression, or subtract from the boldest metaphor aught of its riches, designed to set forth the peerless claims of our Redeemer to the unqualified adoration of my soul. His is the temple of the universe—his the hallelujahs of the heavens—his the hosannas of the church. All things were created by him and for him. He made himself poor that he might make us rich; and shall our tongues falter in his praise, or our hearts not gladly bear their part in the general song? May it be your and my happy lot to stand before him, when he comes in his glory, approved; and to unite with the admiring and adoring throng, singing—

To him who lov'd us, and has wash'd
Us from our sins in his own blood,
And who has made us kings and priests
To his own Father and his God,
The glory and dominion be
To him eternally. Amen!

In this blissful hope, I remain yours, EDITOR.

Personal Evidences.

THERE are the internal and external evidences of the Christian religion; and there are the internal and external evidences of Christian character. By the *internal evidences of Christian character*, we mean the evidences which every individual Christian has that he is born of God—that he is a Christian in deed and in fact. By the *external evidences of Christian character*, we mean those fruits of the Christian faith which distinguish the "Israelite indeed" from one of the nominal Israel of God, in the judgment of all competent and impartial witnesses. But we now speak of the internal evidences of Christian character; and who is the best author on this subject? We answer, John the Apostle. Our "Christian experience," (pardon this accommodation of a modern non-descript phrase,) is best examined in the light of this luminous author on the internal evidences. Of these the following are chief:—

Personal Internal Evidences of Christian Character.

1. We know that we have passed away from death to life, because we love the brethren. He that loves not his brethren abides in death. On this evidence a question arises—viz. *How do we know that we love the brethren?* The same author settles this question. "By this we know that we love the children of God: when we love God and keep his commandments." chap. v. 2.

2. "By this we know that we have known God, if we keep his commandments:" and "Whosoever keeps his word, truly in this man the love of God is perfected." By this we know that we are in him. "Now he who keeps his commandments abides in him, and he in him; and by this we know that he abides in us, even by the Spirit which he has given to us."

These two witnesses in us are sufficient. Love to the brethren is distinguished from natural affection and common benevolence by the most unequivocal criteria. It is a love active and operative for the Lord Messiah's sake, terminating upon a person because he is Christ's. The keeping of all the commandments, or that spirit of universal obedience, exciting and stirring up a person to do all that the Lord commands, *because he commands it*, is as distinct from the lashings of conscience and that servile attention to orders, from a sense of duty, as the affectionate regards of a child to its parents is distinguishable from the unwilling and partial obedience of a slave.

These two witnesses are more credible and responsible than the longest experience ever told, which substitutes any thing else as evidence of Christian character, than what is found written in their testimony by the beloved Apostle.

External Evidences of Christian Character.

1. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you love one another.——*Jesus.*

2. If you know that the Lord is righteous, you know that every one who works righteousness has been begotten by him.——1 John ii. 29.

Internal Evidences that a Person is a Child of the Devil.

1. Whosoever hates his brother, is a murderer; and, like Cain, is of the wicked one. And no one that hates his brother has eternal life abiding in him.——1 John iii. 12, 15.

2. He that works sin is of the devil.——1 John iii. 8.

External evidences that a Person is a Child of the Devil.

In this the children of the devil are manifest: whosoever works not righteousness is not of God; neither he who loves not his brother.——1 John iii. 10.

Infallible Evidences of Self-Deception.

1. If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in darkness, we lie.——1 John i. 6.

2. If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.——1 John i. 8.

3. If a man say, I know him, and keep not his commandments, he is a liar, and the truth is not in him.——John ii. 4.

4. He that says that he is in the light, and hates his brother, is in darkness even till now.——ii. 9.

5. If a man say, I love God, and hate his brother, he is a liar.—iv. 20.

Such are the personal evidences laid down by the infallible pen of this distinguished Apostle of Christ. He who is inquisitive to ascertain whether his heart and life be right in the sight of the Sovereign Judge of all, or whether he be a child of God or of the devil—a hypocrite or self-deceived, needs no other treatise than the catholic epistle of John.

The question of personal interest in the salvation of God, is incomparably the most interesting of all questions. Were a person master of the eloquence of men and angels—could he, in the lofty strains of David and Isaiah—in the glowing and seraphic strains of heaven-taught Prophets, set forth the glory and excellency of the salvation of God—could he describe, with supernatural power and beauty, all the glories which the new heavens and the new earth will unfold—the eternity of bliss, the exceeding and eternal weight of glory which awaits all the righteous—what is it to you or me, candid reader, if we cannot feel that we have a personal interest in it—if we cannot be assured that our individual selves will be partakers of the glory to be revealed? Let us, then, give all heed to make our calling and election certain.

EDITOR.

More Ecclesiastical Tyranny.

WE are more than tired of noticing the acts of tyranny and oppression on the part of the opponents of reformation. We publish but a specimen of the documents forwarded to this office. We add the following simple narrative, not for the purpose of demonstrating the manner of spirit of the prime actors—for that has been already done; but we wish to preserve for the benefit of another generation such an amount of well documented argument and proof as must convince all the candid of the just grounds and reasons we have to attempt reformation of manners, and a restoration of the original institutions. We are, indeed, aware that few could believe, without the most overwhelming evidence, that in the year 1833, in the state of Virginia, and amongst Virginia Baptists, such acts as the following could find any acceptance. But it is not only possible and probable, but indisputably certain, that men, formerly the advocates of liberty, tolerance, and the rights of conscience, are, when a suitable occasion offers, as prescriptive and proscriptive, as denouncing and intolerant, as overbearing and vindictive, as any other men, according to the measure of their talents and opportunities.

Let the following documents speak; and, courteous reader, when you have heard, read the catholic epistle of John.

EDITOR.

PETERSBURG, Va. 6th March, 1833.

Dear Brother,

ON the 4th ult. Mr. Mason, the Pastor of this church, came to me, for the first time for several months, as he said, to have a friendly conversation. In the course of which he asked to know if I would return to the church; and wished to know the terms on which we would unite. I told him, "The New Testament." It met with his approbation. On the Saturday night following the church met, and he made a motion to rescind two resolutions which had been offered by himself, and which he now said he was sorry for; for that he was now satisfied they were both wrong, and he wished to do them away. The first of these resolutions was to prevent yourself, and others, (adherents,) from being permitted to preach in the church; the other, the approval of the Dover Decrees. That party that heretofore went along with him, now forsook him. The resolutions were rescinded. I then made an effort to return into the church, which was not effected.

On Sunday night, at the close of the service, he (Mr. Mason) announced to the congregation from the pulpit, that he would leave this church and the denomination, and on the next night he would publicly assign his reasons for so doing. The members prevailed on him not to do so for a week. This being agreed to on his part, the church called together a council of ministers, which, on Monday the 18th, met with the church, Mr. Mason being present. Messrs. Ball, Kerr and Taylor composed the council.

The meeting being opened, Mr. Kerr was chosen Moderator. The Pastor's case was the first taken up. He stated that he knew not how to act; "that in attempting to restore to the church one party, there were others that said they would leave the church, and thus he was, knowing not what to do—almost crazy." Mr. Kerr then made an apology for his situation. After this a motion was made to forgive the Pastor, which was accordingly done. Then a motion to restore him to the pastoral care of the church; this was also agreed to. After this, then came up the following resolution, or law, and which now stands as did the laws of the Medes and Persians, to wit.—

"Whereas this church has been unfortunately thrown into disorder and strife by certain persons who have assumed the name of *reformers*, and who approve and support the leading sentiments of Alexander Campbell—

"*Resolved*, That we, as a church, cannot retain or receive into our fellowship any such persons; nor will we commune at the Lord's table with them; nor will we receive into our pulpit any persons who shall privately or publicly approve, countenance, or encourage said sentiments.

"*And be it further resolved*, having suffered sorely the painful effects of Campbellism, and having deliberately and solemnly adopted the above resolution, we hereby pledge ourselves, individually and collectively, to carry it into full operation; and it shall be deemed a forfeiture of our fellowship for any member to move to suspend or rescind it."

Mr. Mason first addressed the meeting in favor of the passage of this resolution; was again satisfied, from what Mr. Kerr had told him, that the Dover Decrees were right, and that they were passed by that body constitutionally; and that now he was in favor of abiding by them. He having said this, I could not avoid thinking that but a few days had passed since this man had spoken directly the reverse of this; and further, did agree with me, that before any disturbance had broken out here, that if he had shown me the letters which about that time he received from persons in Richmond, he would have found in me a better friend than were the writers; for he believed there would have been no disturbance. But now see him converted again.

Mr. Ball next advocated the passage of the resolution. He spoke much against the Christian Baptist and the Harbinger; and as for the New Testament,—"that black thing," especially the prefaces—could you but see it, (he said,) raising his hand, and at the same time pronounced Unitarianism! Then stopped.

A brother, a member of the church, now arose. He could not vote for the resolution; he had heard Mr. Ainsly preach, and believed he preached the gospel; therefore, was unwilling to become the means of preventing himself and other members from hearing him and such like men preach; at any rate, he wished to hear and judge for himself.

The Moderator (Mr. Kerr) now arose, and highly complimented the member for his candor. He then explained the intention of the resolution to mean the exclusion of all who should be opposed to its adoption, and who would not be satisfied with it after it was adopted. He, like Mr. Ball, in order to induce the members of this church to act against each other, spoke much against the Harbinger; in doing which he presented views as being in it which are not in it; therefore, it is evident that he makes his representations of your writings the test for brother to act against brother; for sure I am that no one in this church does, or ever did, entertain sentiments such as were spoken by him. He advised the brethren here, as he said he did every where else, not to read the Harbinger, saying, "You ought not to read it. It is necessary, said he, that I should read it, I being a watchman on the walls of Zion, and therefore I take it regularly." Most excellent watchman!

Next Mr. Taylor spoke, he said his principle objection against Mr. Campbell was, that he was opposed to all the benevolent institutions of the day. After this the vote on the resolution was taken and passed—three dissenting votes. Next in order was the following:—

"*Resolved*, That brethren Eaton, Williams, and Mason, the Pastor, together with the ministering brethren present, Ball, Kerr, and Taylor be a committee to draft articles of faith for the government of this church, and report on to-morrow.

19th. The committee's report was to delay for the present the making out the articles of faith as required by the resolution, as such, it was expected, would be published in the Herald that would answer the purpose.

Here is the form, on record, and a copy of a letter for dismissing members, which has been handed to each of those that did not vote for the resolution:—

"Whereas, brethren H. J. Anson, A. Pond, and A. Johnson were opposed to two resolutions adopted by a majority of this church, in relation to the peculiar sentiments of Alexander Campbell, and of those who have embraced and are propagating them. And whereas such opposition to those resolutions is a tacit acknowledgment of approbation of both the sentiments and their advocates, which this church cannot approve: and whereas the church is anxious to relieve itself from the difficulties that must grow, and have grown, out of the existence of those new doctrines in the church—Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the above named brethren be, and are hereby dismissed from the fellowship of this church.

"By order of the Church,

JOHN KERR, *Moderator.*

"F. H. Robertson, *Clerk, pro tem.*"

19*th February*, 1833.

☞Mr. Ball remarks, "The Harbinger comes to his office as an exchange paper, and he reads it because that he hates it."

M. D. J. ANSON

Two Reasons for Reading the Harbinger.

"*I MUST read, for I am a watchman,*" says Elder John Kerr. This is just the reason assigned by the Roman Clergy for reading the Bible themselves, and refusing it (in days of yore) to the laity. This reason was not, it is true, the only one; but one which was sometimes, in a great strait, tendered to the inquisitive. What need is there for the watchman reading rather than those whom he watches, unless they have given up their understanding and conscience into the keeping of the watchman? Mr. Kerr will tell his flock what is in the Harbinger, or give them such a version of it as he thinks is good for their souls. But they, poor weak creatures! are not to be trusted with such a dangerous volume, lest they should be deceived, or undeceived!

But, says Mr. Ball, "*I read it because I hate it.*" This is the reason assigned by another watchman. He reads the Bible because he loves it, and the Harbinger because he hates it. And what book cannot he read? You will say, 'One that he neither loves nor hates.' The Devil reads the Bible (for he can quote it,) and Mr. Ball the Harbinger, for one and the self-same reason. I wonder if they do not hate the author as cordially as his work. I leave this for the casuists, and only ask, was there ever more puerile and splenetic reasons offered in extenuation of the most palpable misdemeanors, than those tendered by these over-zealous champions for human traditions, to cover the true principle of their action and co-operation? The time is short, gentlemen, and the flimsy mantle will soon be torn to pieces which hides you—perhaps, from yourselves as fatally as from your admirers.

EDITOR.

New Year's Evening at Mr. Goodal's.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 68.]

CONVERSATION AFTER DINNER.

WHEN the company were again seated in the parlor, *Father Goodal*, turning to Mr. Reed, said—

Some of the young people have requested me to solicit from brother Reed his views of *the ministry of angels*, as the subject of angels came up at table. I have a subject which I intended to propose; but as there is much anxiety to hear you on this subject, I will give place to the wishes of the young people.

On the 4th of June last, the anniversary of the King's birth day, you gave a discourse, at Newtonfields, on the ministry of angels of which I have heard much spoken. Perhaps the substance of that sermon would be highly acceptable to the whole company.

Mr. Reed.—Always willing to minister to the edification and gratification of my young friends, I cannot refuse to answer any questions they may propose, tending to edification; but as that discourse was the first and the last I ever pronounced on that subject, I fear I could not recall its substance; and all the fragments which I could at this date gather up would be rather a mean repast for the present company.

Mrs. Reed.—Here is sister Fowler, who was talking the other day about that discourse; and if you cannot collect its outlines, I doubt not that she can assist your recollections.

Mr. Reed.—Then I shall rely upon sisters Reed and Fowler; but I think we shall not keep close to the discourse, but intersperse some questions to my young brothers and sisters, and thus make a common meal of it. Here is Thomas Goodal, whom I observed taking notes that day, I dare say he has not yet forgotten the subject. Thomas, can you recollect the method proposed in handling that sublime matter?

Thomas Goodal.—After reading your text from Hebrews, ii. 5. you said, without any introduction you would call the attention of the congregation to the ministry of angels, before you would show why "*the world to come*" was not subjected to their sway. You then proposed to lay before the audience the sum of your knowledge gleaned from the Scriptures on four points—the nature, the number, the ranks, the ministry of angels.

Mr. Reed.—Was there not something said about the meaning of the word *angel?*

Thomas Goodal.—You said it was rather the name of an *office,* than of a *nature;* for any creature of God employed as an executor of his will, might be called his angel, or messenger, whether that creature was animate or inanimate. Thus he calls the winds and the fire his *angels.*

Mr. Reed.—Right, Thomas—all right. Will Robert Fowler favor us with his recollections on the first topic—*the nature of angels?*

Robert Fowler.—The substance only I now remember. You said there were but *three* intelligent natures of which we know any thing. With one of them we had no acquaintance at all but through the Bible. With another we had a little acquaintance by our experience and consciousness. And of the third we knew only what the Bible and the material universe revealed. The first you called the angelic; the second, the human; and the third, the divine. Indeed, you said, whatever salutary knowledge we possessed of any of these intellectual natures was derived from the Bible.

Mr. Reed.—In speaking of "the nature of angels," did we speak only of the nature of messengers in general, or did we then accept the word in its common usage as expressive of an order of celestial rank and dignity?

Robert Fowler.—As expressive of an order of beings of celestial origin and dignity.

Mrs. Fowler.—Will brother Reed state how far he apprehends the analogy between the human and angelic natures to extend?

Mr. Reed.—1st. It is capable of being possessed in common by many distinct persons. 2d. Each of these persons may possess the whole of it, so far as its essential attributes are concerned. 3d. All the participants of this nature have kindred affections; from which we infer that angels are just as *personal* in their being and mode of existence as we are: they have their personal peculiarities and names, as well as a common nature. They enjoy communion, possess all the social affections which belong to men, without any sexual peculiarities; and are susceptible of all the sublime, intellectual, and moral pleasures of rational existence. They, indeed, greatly excel us, in our present mode of existence, in wisdom, knowledge, strength, and intellectual dignity; but whether we may not hereafter equal or excel them in these respects, remains among the sublime secrets of eternity yet to be developed. I need not add, that they are perfectly pure and holy, and therefore their moral enjoyments are perfect and complete.

Mrs. Fowler.—Was there not another point concerning which you said something?

Mr. Reed.—I do not remember.

Maria Goodal.—There was something said about the elements of which they were composed.

Mr. Reed.—I offered a single thought on that subject, which amounted to no more than this—that, as the human body was made out of the elements of this globe, so we might infer that the angels were made out of the elements of

the system which they inhabit; and that we might, therefore, regard them as celestial in their nature as well as in their habitation. But their nature may be better understood through an acquaintance with their ministry, than from analogy. Let me, then, ask sister Maria Goodal what she has to say about their *number?*

Maria Goodal.—I can only mention the Scriptures on which you relied in illustration and proof of your second point. These were the following:—Matth. zxvi. 53. "Do you think that I could not call upon my Father, and he would send me more than twelve legions of angels?" These, you observed, were only the personal attendants of the Messiah. But I did not apprehend on what grounds you regarded them as his personal attendants.

Mr. Reed.—The number *twelve* had reference to *twelve* earthly attendants—the Apostles; and as he chose that definite number already appropriated to his personal attendants, it is but in accordance with a part of the allusion to suppose that it all refers to the same thing. Again, as we have the most ample testimony that 72,000, or twelve legions, is a very inconsiderate proportion of the heavenly hosts, it cannot be supposed that he alluded to the great aggregate, but to that class attached to his person.

Maria Goodal.—This seems to me now the more probable, from the portion of the 68th Psalm, on which you descanted. In the 17th verse a single chariot of God, it is said, consists of *twenty thousand angels.* You alleged that in the original Hebrew it literally read, "The chariot of God is twenty thousand—even thousands of angels." Of these attendants of God, Daniel gives us still more sublime views. Your third evidence was, if I mistake not, from Daniel vii. 5. The Ancient of Days was attended with an immense retinue. "Thousand thousands ministered to him, and myriads of myriads waited on him." This, you observed, was the largest number of any thing found in the arithmetic of the Bible. You next observed that the Saviour had given us a hint about the angels of little children, which implied an inconceivably large number: "Their angels do always behold the face of my Father in heaven." If all infants are under the guardian care of angels, how immense their number! If I mistake not, you concluded with the testimony of Paul in the 12th chapter of Hebrews, who said that Christians are associated with an *innumerable* multitude of angels.

Robert Fowler.—My cousin Maria has forgotten the strongest evidence of the immensity of their number, which Mr. Reed said was found in the Bible.

Mr. Reed.—I think Maria has been more minute than I could have been, and I do not at present recollect a passage which she has not brought forward.

Robert Fowler.—Have you forgotten Revelations v. 12.? "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living creatures and the elders; *and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.*"

Mr. Goodal.—What an inconceivable multitude! What an army has the Lord of hosts! The armies of the sky, how grand and powerful! I am overwhelmed at the thought! And these ten thousand times ten thousand, and the thousands of thousands are all standing before *the Lamb that was slain,* worshipping our Redeemer. How my soul longs for that glorious sight!—to see my Lord Messiah, who stood before Pontius Pilate, despised and rejected of men, doomed to death by the ruffian hands of Roman soldiers, surrounded with this immense host of worshipping angels, and to hear them tune their lyres to the song, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing"—

> "My soul anticipates the day,
> Would stretch her wings and soar away,
> To aid the song, and palm to bear,
> And bow, the chief of sinners, there."

Ten thousand times ten thousand! What a multitude! Can any of my grand children compute how many in our arithmetic is ten thousand times ten thousand?

Robert Fowler.—One hundred millions exactly!

Mr. Goodal.—An army of one hundred millions, besides thousands of thousands!! And each one of them as powerful as he, who, with the rapidity of a glance of the mind, passed through all Egypt, 700 miles in length, and 250 in breadth, and, at the moment of midnight, struck dead the whole firstborn of man and beast.

What king can compare with our King! His terrestrial army weakest in the front, swarms of insects; locusts, caterpillars, the palmer worm; wild beasts; famine, pestilence; winds, floods, and flames; though weak in the detail, how powerful in concert! His celestial army ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of angels. Why should Christians tremble or despond? Greater is he, and more numerous are they who are on our side, than all that are against us. How august will be the appearance of the Lord descending in his glory, amidst the acclamations of one hundred millions of angels, the weakest of whom could crush a world more easily than I can crush a moth! If they shouted with joy when the earth was born—if they hailed with hosannas the Babe of Bethlehem, what will be their hallelujahs when accompanying the King in his glory!

"When the King of kings comes,
When the Lord of lords comes,
We shall have a joyful day
When the King of kings comes!"

Mrs. Fowler.—The phrase "*Lord of hosts*" now means more with me than ever. Surely to be a child of God and an heir of heaven, is more honorable than to be descended from the most illustrious and imperial line that ever swayed a sceptre!

Mr. Williamson.—I am extremely interested to know what Mr. Reed has to say about the *ranks of angels*. Their nature and number having been so fully ascertained, I am intensely curious to know what may be said about their ranks.

Mr. Reed.—As my young friends seem to remember more of my sermon than I do myself, I think I had better leave it to them to arrange the ideas offered upon the titles and offices of angels. I shall begin with Thomas Goodal again.

Thomas Goodal.—Here I am stranded, Mr. Reed. You said something about the classification of angels under different Princes, to whom was assigned the dominion of the whole universe. You spoke something of the partitioning off the earth and its inhabitants under certain angelic chiefs. But I cannot now recall, for I did not then understand, what you advanced on the kingdom of angels.

Mr. Reed.—"The kingdom of angels!" This is a curious phrase. Where did you hear it?

Thomas Goodal.—I heard my aunt Fowler speaking of a regularly organized kingdom of angels; and I did not suspect that the phrase was improper.

Mrs. Fowler.—And I got it from Mr. Reed!

Mr. Reed.—I did not know but some writer had used that phrase. I own, indeed, that I have chosen it; but I was not sure that it was a very proper one, and would like to have company. But I know of no better phrase, because there is certainly an organized classification of angels whether we reason from analogy, or from the data which the Prophets and Apostles have furnished. I will arrange my proofs as methodically as the occasion permits:—

1. There are princes (αρχαι, or principalities,) in heaven as well as upon earth. The highest officers in imperial Rome, like the highest in the empire of Alexander, were by the Greeks called *archai*. Under these were presidents, authorities, dominions; called in Paul's list of heavenly hierarchies, thrones, governments, dominions, authorities, lordships. We find all the terms denoting the high rank and dignity in Paul's list of honorables in heaven. They are like the Jewish magistrates called *theoi*, gods; *archai*, princes; *exousiai*, authorities; *dunameis*, powers; *thronoi*, thrones. See Ep. i. 21. iii. 10.

Rom. viii. 38. 39. Col. i. 16. 1 Peter iii. 22. These are all found in the plural form in references to the governments in heaven. Hence there are many princes, presidents, governors and lords among the angels; consequently, under them classes who owe them allegiance as viceroys of the ETERNAL KING.

2. Paul unequivocally asserts this, Eph. i. 21. Speaking of the exalted Messiah, he affirms that he is renowned not only above the highest *titles*, or *names*, in earthly kingdoms, but "is exalted ABOVE EVERY NAME *named in the world to come*;" that is, to us, in the heavenly world. His titles, names, and honors transcend the hierarchies of heaven as they do all the potentates on earth.

3. The apostacy of Satan, one of the princes, if not the highest dignitary in heaven, with those numerous legions under him, is also a proof to us (as we have the kingdom of Satan, with all the ranks, officers, and organization of a kingdom) that there is a kingdom of angels under thrones, princes, and chiefs. Satan is called the Prince of this world, by one conversant with the affairs of the kingdom of angels.

4. It would appear from the Old Testament, that the tribes of this earth and the affairs of particular countries were assigned to certain chiefs, under whom was a class of angels of different ranks and dignities. Thus Michael was "the prince of the Jews," as Gabriel intimates to Daniel; nay, he calls Michael "one of the chief princes," Dan. x. 13. and adds, verse 21, same chapter, "There is none who holds with me" in your affairs, "save Michael your prince."

Mrs. Foster.—Here let me interrupt you by asking a question: Was the prince of Persia, think you, an angelic chief, who presided over the affairs of Persia? and was the prince of Grecia the presiding angel over the affairs of Greece?

Mr. Reed.—It would appear most probable that the prince of Persia and the prince of Grecia were angelic princes in the kingdom of Satan. That the prince of Persia was not a man is most probable. The circumstance of his opposing Gabriel for twenty-one days, and also because the prince of Persia in the same period is distinguished from the kings of Persia. The words of the prophet are these: "But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days; but, lo! Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me, and I remained there with the kings of Persia." If, then, the prince of Persia was an angelic potentate, good or evil, we have all reason to suppose that the prince of Grecia was of the same order. This is still more probable from the fact that Gabriel proposes to fight with the prince of Persia in behalf of Daniel's people; and unless we admit that it was with the mind of an earthly potentate, he would find a weak antagonist in a Persian prince. Again he adds, "When I am gone forth to fight with the prince of Persia, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come."

Mr. Williamson.—Enough is said to sustain your proposition, be this as it may; and one of two lessons must be taught in these passages—either that a celestial or some infernal prince presides over every nation, or that the celestial hosts are employed in turning the minds of men and effecting all the special providences or influences in nature and society.

Mrs. Fowler.—I am not willing that brother Reed should yet dismiss the third topic. I have another question.— But here comes Maria with a server richly laden with the spoils of the orchard.

EDITOR.

Epaphras---No. 7.

Dear Sir,

I HAVE now carefully, and, I might add, devoutly considered all you have written in reply to my letters. I conditioned in the commencement that I would finish my series before I would reply to

any thing you might reply. I have not forgotten my promise. I have finished my series, or, at least, the first part of it, and now resume my pen to reply to your answers. When I say *reply*, you must not imagine that I am about to enter into a controversy with you, or to contend for my own views, if in any thing they differ from yours, when fully explained. I will premise, with all emphasis too, that your replies have been generally, very generally, acceptable to my mind. Indeed, there are few, very few matters in which I differ from you, when you fully explain yourself. I have still, however, an item or two for your further consideration; and, to return to the beginning, I will very briefly state the matter on which you have not given me full satisfaction.

Touching the phrase "*ancient gospel*," and the acceptation of it in 1823 and 1827, I am not fully satisfied. Let me categorically ask you by what authority you and others say, "For the remission of sins and for the gift of the Holy Spirit, I immerse you into ——"? And do you call this practice the restoration of the ancient gospel, which I understand began to be practised in the year 1827? In reading a second time the Christian Baptist, vol. 4. I was forcibly struck with your answer to Paulinus in the April number of said volume, and thought that you had there gone far enough; but the addition of "for the gift of the Holy Spirit," and for the repeating in the water, "for the remission of sins I immerse you," seems to be without authority. Before I give you my views in full on this practice, I must have your explanation.

In the Lord yours as ever,

EPAPHRAS.

Reply to Epaphras---No. 7.

Dear Sir,

I AM peculiarly happy to have a single line from you on my replies to your letters, and more especially to learn that in general my explanations have been satisfactory. There is no person whose approbation I desire more than yours. The many years, and the great amount of reading, learning, and diligent attention to the oracles of God, which you have applied to all the questions now agitated amongst us, give to your approbation and your judgment more weight with me than I could allow to those of all my opponents multiplied together. There is another brother and father in Philadelphia, like yourself, well advanced in years, and not excelled in America for real learning and critical information in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, in all biblical criticism; one who has taught the sons of Abraham their own language; one who has devoted many years to primitive Christianity, and sacrificed all honors and emoluments on the altar of his devotion to the Apostles' doctrine; whose approbation and decision in favor of the cause we plead, afford me a satisfaction which more than compensates all the denunciations, anathemas, and reproaches of

the confederated ranks of our opponents. While I can call no man Master or Father in the sense prohibited by our Master in heaven, still I cannot but feel a great deference for the judgment of men uniting in themselves extensive erudition, high mental endowments, and unfeigned piety. Such deference I cannot but feel, and I must occasionally express it.

The matter called up in your letter, (would that it had been much longer!) you admit merits much attention. The authority for pronouncing these words in the water, "For the remission of sins I immerse you," is not that of a positive commandment, nor of a scriptural precedent. Our reasons for so doing are, that Peter commanded the believing penitents to be immersed for remission; and consequently those who immersed them, immersed them for remission, whether it was expressed aloud or implied; and in this gainsaying age, for the sake of impressing it upon the attention of the candidate and the spectators, it is deemed expedient to speak aloud what is understood by the candidate and the immerser at the time. You may say, then, that we have *inferential* authority, and that equivalent to apostolic precedent. For adding the phrase, "and for the gift of the Holy Spirit," few, if any of the reformers use it. For my part, I never did, because that gift stands not in the same relation to baptism as does remission. It was a something added to the commandment, "Be baptized, every one of you, for remission;" and was evidently sometimes in actual practice wholly disconnected with baptism. Some believed and were baptized, and afterwards received that gift, and some received that gift before they were baptized; but there is no instance of remission not accompanying baptism, except when faith was lacking in the subject. Simon Magus' case affords no exception; for those who contend that faith *alone* is sufficient for remission, have just as much difficulty in disposing of this case as we can have: for if Simon was not remitted in immersion, neither was he by his faith: yet it is said he believed as well as was baptized. I have some things to add on the words, "for the gift of the Holy Spirit," which I reserve till I hear from you again.

Touching the second question you propose to me, I will briefly state, that, until the close of 1827, there was no person doing the work of an evangelist under the banners of the reformation. We had been preparing the way, and urging it upon others to go to work. In my debate with Mr. M'Calla I exhorted the Baptist preachers *not only to baptize for the remission of sins*, but to urge an *immediate* submission to this gracious ordinance. For my part, I did no more than immerse such as came forward at our ordinary church meetings, explaining to them the meaning of baptism for remission. In the April of 1827, four months before we had an evangelist elected, I did, it is true, in my answers to Mr. Broaddus, state in the number to which you have referred, as follows—what I should do were I addressing my fellow-citizens as an evangelist, as under the gospel, and not under the law—in the following words:—"I would, in addressing them, demonstrate that the principles, laws, or light in that volume, would prove their

awful condemnation in the day of vengeance, if they obeyed not. I would assure them that the *first* commandment obligatory on them was, "*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.*" That disobedience to this commandment would prove their condemnation. If asked for the *second* commandment, I would reply, "*Be immersed, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of your sins.*" Until these two commandments were obeyed, I would show them that they were not in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and that they were worthy of condemnation, if on no other account, on this, that "light was come into the world, and they loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil." These *commandments* not obeyed, I would endeavor to convince them that they could promise themselves nothing on any rational principle, but an eternal separation from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power in the day of righteous retribution."*

But it was not until four months from this date that we had an evangelist elected. In the close of the August following I had the inexpressible satisfaction, and I shall ever esteem it as the highest honor conferred on me—I say, I had the inexpressible satisfaction of inducing my fellow-laborer and beloved brother, *Walter Scott*, now well known as far as this reformation has sounded forth, to accompany me to the Mahoning Association, and of having him elected to be an evangelist for that year. He, with the utmost promptitude, and at the no small expense of his own feelings in leaving his infant family and his academy, casting all his cares upon the Lord, forsook, for the time being, all that binds a man of the loftiest sentiments and the most tender emotions to the wife of his youth and his tender offspring, accepted the call, and soon commenced his operations in the bounds of that Association.

Without consulting with flesh and blood, he was soon led to the practice of these principles. He, with no ordinary ability, zeal, and devotion, enforced these two commandments, and urged an *immediate* submission to the ordinance. So far, then, as the calling upon persons to act promptly on their faith, to come forward, and to be baptized for remission, and the use of these words in the act of immersion, "For the remission of your sins I immerse you," is the restoration of the gospel, he was not only the first evangelist under the banners of reformation, in point of time; but the first practical restorer of the ancient gospel. This event, then, my dear sir, which happened in the close of the year 1827, gives to that era a new importance and an emphasis in the history of this reformation.

A great excitement prevailed under his labors. Many preachers and many hundreds of hearers thought that old things had become new, and were cordially converted to the primitive faith and practice. His labors and self-denial, his persecutions, and reproaches will never be forgotten; but the success, the triumphant success of the cause he plead, was, to his mind, and would be in the estimation of every benevolent understanding, a reward not only for the toils of a

*Christian Baptist, vol. 4, page 212.

few months, but for the toils of the longest life. Since that time the number of evangelists has greatly increased, and many thousands have been blessed with the knowledge of salvation through the remission of their sins. The ground having been extensively prepared for the reception of the primitive faith and institutions, the reformation rapidly spread all over this continent, and is hourly extending its conquests, not only under the governments in the New World, but in the Old World. Blessed be the name of the Lord, who alone does all these great things!

The two great and distinguishing traits of the actual restoration of the gospel, are, the calling upon the believers to act promptly upon their faith, and to baptize them forthwith for remission. The apostolic institution without this gospel, or the gospel without these institutions, can effect no permanent good to men, nor glory to the heavens.

But, sir, in answering your second question I have gone too far into details; but I trust you will perceive from this brief sketch, why it is that the year 1827 stands so conspicuous in the history of this reformation; and why the events which it records should be called the practical restoration of the ancient gospel.

Hoping to hear still farther from you on these sublime themes, I remain as before, EDITOR.

To Charles Cassedy, Esq.

NO. III.

Respected Sir,

YOUR chief difficulty in the way of an implicit surrender to Jesus Christ is embraced in the following item:—

The Mosaic account of creation assigns not to man an object suited to his constitution, alike worthy of him and his Maker; nor does it suitably explain many phenomena in the animal and vegetable creation. This is my own version of the matter, it is true; but I doubt not that you assent to it as a faithful one.

I would travel on foot a hundred miles, at least, to converse with a sensible man, who had carefully read the Old and New Testaments without a preconceived idea on the contents of these volumes. All, all of us, are more or less disqualified to receive with candor and to judge with impartiality the messages of the Prophets, because in our earlier years we have fallen into bad company, and have either imagined some system of perfection in morals and theology, or have been duped by the cunning priests, or have been bewildered by our parents and tutors before reason assumed the throne. The fancies and theories of the pseudo-philosophers, and the dogmas of the pseudo-priests, are equally hostile to the knowledge of these sacred writings. You, my dear sir, more enlarged in your horizon, and consequently more liberal in your views, cannot bow with deference to the excathedra dogmas of baseless science, or of the petit popes of either ancient or modern times. Notwithstanding I am not without my fears that you may

have been seriously injured by the very influence which, of all others, you most denounce. The reason of my fears is, that I find you demurring at the narrative of Moses, because his statements correspond not with the assumptions and dicta of the pseudo-philosophers, and of the patented soothsayers and sorcerers of the temple of reason. For instance, after a very eloquent display of the splendors of the human constitution, after a very philosophical development of the physical, intellectual, and moral powers of man, you ask, "Can it be possible, sir, that *man*, thus nobly endowed, and thus most exquisitely organized, physically and intellectually, should have been placed in a garden merely to dress it and to keep it?" Now, sir, although it may have wholly escaped you what pseudo-philosopher or priest prompted this difficulty, certain it is that some one, in some unpropitious moment, gave a false direction to your mind on this subject: for Moses never said that *Adam, or man, was placed in a garden* MERELY *to dress it and to keep it.* But, sir, his physical and intellectual constitution, which you have so interestingly described, made his dressing and keeping of a garden the only proper and suitable employment for both his physical and intellectual powers. Man, created and endowed with such limbs, and arms, and trunk, with such organs and instruments of labor, would have been most unhappy without some employment. And was it not most kind in the Creator to make that employment the most agreeable and delightful imaginable! Where, think you, ought a being so constituted to have been placed? In a wilderness? In a desert? In the air? On the water? Nay, rather in a garden of delights—in a paradise teeming with all the riches, with all the blooming beauties of the vegetable kingdom, abounding with all that the sensitive nature of man could desire. And for the development of thought—for intellectual enjoyment, what situation could equal Eden? If labor, if the exercise of our faculties is necessary to intellectual as to physical enjoyment, what labor could you have assigned man more congenial with his whole nature, than the dressing and keeping of a garden. Not doomed to the drudgery and toil which sin has imposed upon our race, his mind was at perfect liberty to seek enjoyments from all the fountains of bliss, sensitive, intellectual, and moral. The delicious breezes of Eden, perfumed with a thousand odors, the spicy breath of morning and evening, the glowing beauties of noon, the warbling harmonies of the aerial concerts, the virgin sweets of all the flowers and fruits, opened to him sources of enjoyment, and carried his thoughts to the sempiternal fountain of all good.

Had primitive man been doomed to the labors of the metalic kingdom—had he to tear up the earth with a ploughshare—had he, with his bow and arrow, to traverse forests for his food, what time for the cultivation and entertainment of his rational nature? Is not ignorance the inseparable handmaid of servile drudgery and constant toil? And would not such circumstances have led Adam to suspect the motives of his Creator? Were you, my dear sir, with all your stock of good sense and native philosophy, to lay your ingenuity under tribute, you could not find for such a being as you have eloquently described Adam

to have been—a selection so perfectly congruous, so every way indicative of the power, wisdom, and goodness of his Creator, as that in which Moses locates him.

But the pseudo-philosophers have, by some indirect means, done you a greater injury than this. They have led you to suppose that Adam and his progeny were to have been confined to Eden until it would have been too small for them. But who else than crazy philosophers or crazy doctors could teach that God was under any sort of necessity of keeping the race in this planet until it would have covered the whole earth as the grass covers the field. Was that universe and those systems of worlds, of which you spoke with so much admiration, so small, so inaccessible, that man must be doomed in any supposable circumstance to continue forever on this earth! And does this same Moses give us no data from which we might have inferred the happy lot of man had he continued in the friendship of his Maker! Does he not, in the instance which he gives us of the translation of one perfect and righteous man to a brighter and a better world than this ever was, even in its halest and most uncontaminated days, guide our curiosity into another channel, and show us how easy to have found a way of disposing of our race without the necessity of death or even the enlargement of Eden! You will see, then, respected sir, there could be no difficulty in disposing of our race according to the Mosaic account, had it multiplied and increased in accordance with all your calculations, had man maintained his fealty to the crown of heaven. When his loyalty had been fully tested, you will see, by a single thought, upon the premises now before us, how easy it would have been for his kind Father to have given him a larger and better estate, and to have provided the means for his transportation to it. Nothing, then, believe me, sir, but your having approached the first chapters of Genesis under some foreign influence, could have originated in your mind such difficulties—difficulties, too, which the Mosaic account makes of such easy solution.

Another hypothesis oppresses you—a favorite one, too, with the priesthood; which, equally with the others, militates much against your perception of the wisdom and goodness displayed in the Mosaic account. It is assumed that man was necessarily immortal; and, consequently, his apostacy in Eden was a forfeiture of immortality. This is mere assumption; for, unless a new dispensation had been introduced containing immortality, or guarantying it upon some other condition than the conditions propounded in Eden, man's fall could not have subjected him to more than the simple loss of all the earthly blessings of the earthly life which he held upon the tenure of his obedience. But now that immortality is proposed through the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, a non-compliance with the propositions of this Prince of life eternal, subjects man to the loss not merely of his earthly body and life, but to a second death—an eternal excision from another tree of life which grows in the heavenly paradise of God. But this only by the way. Were not your horizon, my good sir, clouded with these mists of a false philosophy, those theoretic and

speculative difficulties could find no abiding in one of such capacity for rational and elevated inquiry.

Another difficulty yet remains with regard to the teeth and claws of many animals, and to the thorns, and briars, and thistles which are found in this afflicted world. This, too, is specifically the same with your other difficulties. Suppose God omniscient, or suppose him not, and yet on either hypothesis the Mosaic narrative is free from this difficulty. First take the more unreasonable hypothesis: say he was not omniscient; and that he did not know what Adam would do; then, I ask, was it not wise to provide for either contingency? The seeds of all poisons and the roots of all bitterness are prepared for the contingency. The limbs and jaws of some animals are armed, and all that is wanting is a general order to begin the work of death. But that they must, whether or not Adam sinned, necessarily operate as they since have done, is negatived by the fact, that habit begets a second nature; and that man himself, and all the vegetable and animal creation have been changed again and again by a thousand influences, which, on another hypothesis, might have produced quite a different system.

Even as it is, and as our own experience and observation teach when God pleases, the work of destruction, by the agency of these weapons, waxes and wanes to an astonishing degree. The thorn, the thistle, and the briar at one time spread with such rapid strides as if they were to possess themselves of the land; at another time, in the same country, there is scarce a remnant alive to preserve seed. So with the voracious insects and animals. The locust, caterpillar, palmer worm, the fiery serpent, and ravenous beasts of prey, like the plagues of Egypt, at one time swarm over whole countries; at another time they are not to be found. The lion and the lamb, the leopard and the kid once lived on terms of friendship, and they will do so again; a time will come when the lion will eat straw like the ox.*

---

*The lion's eating straw is not more incredible than that the cow now lives on fish, which, in high latitudes, is a well established fact. The following, together with volumes of the same sort, show what may be done even yet, teeth and claws to the contrary notwithstanding:—

The jackal, when taken young, acquires the same affectionate manners as a dog.—K. Linn. 140—The lion has been repeatedly tamed. So has the fox. Rubens had a tame lion four weeks in his chamber, to paint from. Pennant saw an hyena as tame as a dog. The large babyroussa, "though brutal and ferocious, are easily tamed."—Buffon. The ounce may be trained to hunt, and become as tractable as a pointer.—K. Linn. 148 The large tiger cat is easily tamed.—152. The mountain lynx has mild and gentle manners.—155. The Egyptian ichnuemon may be softened so as to be kept in a house, like a cat.—159 The otter may be taught to catch fish for its master.—173. The ferret is domesticated, and employed to catch rabbits.—180 The snow-weasel may be trained to follow a person anywhere.—183 We see the bear repeatedly in our public streets. The badger may be also made docile, if caught young.—187 The racoon is easily tamed, and sportive, but unlucky and inquisitive, like a monkey.—189 The rhinoceros may be tamed in some degree. —113. The hippotamus also.—P. 347.

The tiger if taken young, may be domesticated. One six weeks old, was taken on board the Pitt East Indiaman, in 1790, and arrived in England be-

But take the more rational hypothesis, and say that God foresaw the fortunes of our race; then was it not every way consistent to be prepared for it?

---

fore it had quite completed its first year. It was as playful as a kitten, and frequently slept with the sailors in their hammocks. It would run out on the bowsprit, climb about the ship like a cat, and play with a dog there. Deposited in the Tower of London, it continued there to be perfectly good natured, and was never guilty of any savage tricks. In 1801, it admitted a puppy terrier and mastiff to be successively its inmates, and recognised with delight the the ship-carpenter, who came to see him two years after they had been separated, licked his hands, and fawned upon him like a cat.—Bingl. An. Biog. v. i. p. 230. The faquirs of Hindostan sometimes go about with their tame tigers.

Bishop Heber mentions that Mr. Trail, in India, had an hyena for several years which followed him like a dog, and fawned on his acquaintance.

A tame crocodile was, in 1828, kept at Chantilly. It was so mild, that it was caressed by its keeper without danger.

Mrs. Bowditch, widow of the Ashantee traveller, had a tame leopard. Gesner mentions that Francis I. kept one, which he used in hunting. It was carried before him by an attendant on a horse. Mr. Barrow procured, in Africa, a young leopard, which "became instantly tame, and as playful as the kitten."

M. F. Cuvier describes a young wolf that was brought up like a young dog. It became familiar with every person whom he was in the habit of seeing, followed his master everywhere, was obedient to his voice, and differed in nothing from the tamest dog. Its owner gave him to the Royal Menagerie at Paris; and was affectionately recognised by it eighteen months afterward.—When, after another absence of three years, he went to it, though it was dark; it knew him by his voice, placed its fore-paws on his shoulders and licked his face, and became ill and pined because he went away.

Kolben mentions of the baboons at the Cape, that if brought up young with milk, they become as watchful over their master's things as any house dog.—Vaillant declares of the one he had, that it was more watchful than any of his dogs, and frequently warned him of the approach of predatory animals, when the dogs seemed unconscious that they were near. Father Carli, in his History of Angola, mentions that he had taught monkeys to attend him, to guard him, while sleeping, against thieves and rats, to comb his head and fetch his water. —Goldsm. N. H. vol. ii. p. 493.

The bison and buffalo, though graminivorous, are fierce and dangerous: and Mr. Cunningham, in his account of New South Wales, remarks, "Our *wild* animals are numerous, but few of them are carnivorous." The form of the teeth is not decisive of their nature in this respect, for "though the tapir's mouth is armed with twenty sharp cutting teeth, he is not carnivorous." —Buffon.

In 1827 M. Pelletau, director of the African Company at Senegal, trained a lion, caught in the forest there, to be very tractable, and to live in amity with the other animals which his master kept. He slept in the same place with sheep, dogs, cats, monkeys, geese and ducks. When eight months old, a terrier brought forth two puppies on his bed, which excited a great interest in him, and he caressed them, as if their parent.—Bingl. An. Biog. vol. i. p. 222. At New Hargard, in Germany, the landlord placed on the floor a large dish of soup, and then gave a loud whistle; immediately a mastiff, an Angora cat, an old raven, and a large rat with a bell, entered the room. All four went to the dish and fed together.—*Ib.* vol. ii. p. 21. John Austin, who for seventeen years had occupied himself in "training creatures of opposite natures to live together in content and affection," exhibited, in his ambulatory show, a cat, a rat, a mouse, a hawk, a rabbit, a guinea-pig, an owl, a pigeon, a starling,

Volumes might be written in vindication of all these matters; but a word to the wise is sufficient. Were your mind disabused from the hypotheses of the pseudo-philosophers and from the dogmas of the pseudo-priests, I doubt not that you would find a ready answer for one proposing the difficulties which now encompass you!

You are pleased to recapitulate and to comprehend your chief difficulties in the form of questions; and now permit me, in conclusion of my reply, to quote your questions, and to affix to them such replies as these premises will warrant.

1. "Was it intended by the *Almighty Creator* that our first parents and their innumerable progeny were to confine their whole attention and wonderful energies to the cultivating and dressing of a garden?"

Answer.—Moses no where affirms that they were.

2. "Was that garden circumscribed to definite and insurmountable bounds; or were its environs the ends of the earth, the circumference of the whole globe? In either case, and suppose man had not fallen, by which *fall* alone we are taught that *death* came into the world, would there at this day have been room for the numerous race of our first parents in the garden, or even on the surface of our globe? If, on the contrary, those original parents were not invested with procreative powers; or, if endowed therewith, were doomed to perpetual barrenness, was the earth forever to continue an uncultivated wilderness, the undisputed and undivided empire of wild beasts?"

Answer.—No. To this question, in every form which ingenuity can place it, the answer is,—Moses says not one word that necessarily involves any such conclusions. He shows us, in the case of Enoch, how easy it was for Omnipotence to remove all these encumbrances.

3. "Did the introduction of *death* into the world, by the *fall* of man, change the original conformation of the jaws of carnivorous animals, and make the rivers and the oceans of the globe theatres of robbery, carnage, and bloodshed? In fine, did the original sin of Adam make the earth bring forth thorns, and briars, and noxious weeds, &c."

Answer.—I answer, No: but to the former it gave employment; and to the latter license to proceed in accordance with the new circumstances into which man had, by his apostacy from God, precipitated himself. But that on another contingency the animal and vegetable kingdoms could not by omnipotence have been otherwise regulated and governed, (to say nothing of the volumes of facts which natural history discloses,) is, to one who admits the name ALMIGHTY, wholly inadmissable.

A few reflections on the whole premises now before us, shall, in my next number, close my reply to your letter.

In all benevolence, &c.

EDITOR.

---

and a sparrow, all living harmoniously together in a cage of such dimensions as he could carry about. He effected this amity by keeping them all well fed, and by accustoming each to the other at a very early period of their lives.

[Menageries, vol. 1. Lib. Entert. Knowl.]

Mr. Broaddus' Form of a Church Covenant.

King William, Va. 18th February, 1833.

Dear Brother Campbell,

AGREEABLY to my promise I send you an authentic copy of the recent proceedings, had in the church at Beulah, to which Mr. A. Broaddus ministers. The same covenant, constitution and rules, were (as I am credibly informed) adopted by the church formed at Mangohick out of the persons who declared non-fellowship with our church. I was present when the church was constituted, and heard the covenant, &c. read, and according to my best recollection, this is a copy; but this is not the evidence upon which I go. The said church adopted and subscribed this instrument of writing after having it once read by Mr. B. and I am confident there were not half a dozen who had even read it before. This you will doubtless think was doing business *promptly.*

Yours &c. C. W. TALIAFERRO.

Memorandum of Beulah Church; made Nov. 1832.

Beulah Church, King William county, was constituted of members, previously belonging to Upper College church, Sept. 26th. 1812.—Elders John Courtney, R. B. Semple, and Chas. Talley attending on the occasion. On the same day, Josh. Gwathmey, Josh. Fox and J. Robinson, were ordained as deacons in the church. Elder Robert B. Semple officiated as pastor in this church for a considerable time. On his resignation, Elder Wm. Hatcheld was called to the office, who has been succeeded by Elder A. Broaddus, who is the present preacher, and acts in the capacity of pastor; Deacons J. Robinson and Josh. Fox of the former appointment; and recently Rich. Gwathmey, Wm. S. Ryland and Thos. Dabney.

This church having lately passed a resolution to have the church covenant, constitution and rules of order and decorum revised and amended, a committee was appointed for that purpose, who have reported the following forms and articles, which are now adopted by this church.

THE CHURCH COVENANT.

We whose names are hereunto subjoined (baptised upon profession of faith) being persuaded that it will conduce to the glory of God and our own spiritual prosperity; and therefore, that it is both our duty and privilege to be formed into a gospel church, have resolved in the fear of God, and in the name of Jesus Christ, thus to unite ourselves together in one body, under one head, jointly to live and act as a church, according to the Spirit and precepts of the gospel of Christ.

We own and acknowledge the Holy Scriptures as the only standard by which all principles and practices in religion are to be tried. According to this standard we maintain that baptism belongs only to those who give satisfactory evidence of true faith in Jesus Christ; and is rightly performed by immersion in water—that it is not the means by which we actually receive pardon, justification and acceptance with God, but is a declaration of our interest, as believers, in

these great and saving blessings; and at the same time a pledge of our consecration to God, and that it is the proper manner of openly putting on Christ.

That the Lord's Supper is intended for the social commemoration of the death of Christ, and the saving benefits thence resulting; and appears properly to belong to baptised believers in church fellowship. Moreover we consider it proper to add, as touching certain great leading truths held forth in the Holy Scriptures—That we acknowledge and avow the doctrine of the depravity and just condemnation of man, the divine and human nature of Jesus Christ the son of God;—Atonement for sin by his blood shedding and death;—Justification before God by faith in Jesus Christ, on account of his blood and righteousness;—Our dependence on the influence of the Holy Spirit, in leading us to repentance, and in the sanctification of our nature;—and the necessity of holiness of heart, righteousness of life, and (in a word) of obedience to all the known will of God—And last, ly that there will be a general resurrection and a general judgment, when the final states of mankind will be decided, according to the deeds done in the body—We own and acknowledge Jesus Christ as the only supreme head and lawgiver of his church; and desire therefore to surrender ourselves in soul and body to him—to his keeping, his government, and his service;—to be guided by the dictates of his holy will, made known in his word, both in our faith and practice.—And we do hereby covenant and agree, that we will endeavor to be subject one to another in the Lord;—to bear each other's burdens;—to promote, as we may be enabled, each other's well being, and to unite our efforts in the common cause of our Lord and Saviour. While thus we would devote ourselves, jointly and severally, to the authority and control of the Great King in Zion, we implore his condescending regard, the acceptance of our persons, and our services, and his efficacious grace, to aid us in the toils, and duties of life's pilgrimage, till we may exchange the church militant for the church triumphant;—to the praise of the glory of God in Christ Jesus—Amen.

Done at Beulah Meeting-House, King William, the ——— day of ———

THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

1st. This Church is called and known by the name of Beulah (Baptist) Church.

2nd. Persons are admissible to membership in this church, who have given satisfactory evidence of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and have been baptised (that is immersed) in an orderly manner in the name of the sacred Three, as directed by our Lord—and such persons are entitled to continued church fellowship, so long as they are considered not guilty of unchristian conduct, and maintain no serious error to the troubling of the church, and the injury of the cause of religion.

3rd. The government of the church shall be in the hands of the free male members. Other members may assist in the discipline as wit

nesses, and in preparing matters for decision, and giving any necessary information. And in the choice of a pastor, the free female members, as well as the males, shall be entitled to vote.

4th. In all questions or cases coming before the church, a majority of the members present shall be sufficient for a decision; except in the reception or admission of members; in which case, the church, if possible, should be unanimous: and in cases of special importance a full church meeting is particularly desirable.

5th. It shall be considered the duty of the church, and especially of the Deacons, to use all proper means for the purpose of keeping up the regular stated preaching of the gospel, and other exercises of Divine worship; to procure (if practicable) a Pastor to dwell among us; and in the want or absence of a Pastor, to encourage the regular meeting together of the church for social worship, reading the Scriptures, exhortation, &c. every Lord's day, when they cannot attend some other place of worship to greater edification.

6th. It shall be considered the duty of all the members of the church possessed of this world's goods, to contribute thereof as God may have prospered them, towards the requisite expenses of the church, whether for the support of the ministry, the assistance of the needy, or any other necessary purpose, and on the Deacons it lies particularly to see that this duty be not neglected.

RESOLUTIONS OR RULES OF ORDER AND DECORUM.

Resolved, That stated meetings for church discipline and public worship be held on the fourth Lord's day and the Saturday preceding at Beulah Meeting-house, or elsewhere. Service to commence between 11 and 12 o'clock

That the Lord's Supper be administered at the monthly meeting in March, May, August, and October, or in case of failure at either of those seasons, then at the next monthly meeting.

That when a free male member shall notoriously neglect to attend the church meetings, he shall be deemed delinquent, and dealt with accordingly, unless sufficient reason be assigned for such omission. Any member living in habitual neglect of the public worship of God, shall likewise be considered delinquent.

That the minister act as moderator in church meetings; or in his absence, that a moderator be chosen by the church, and that due order and decorum be observed in all our proceedings.

That we discountenance extravagance and superfluity in dress, and pomp and vain parade in life, and renounce those amusements and pursuits, which appear inconsistent with the christian character.

That in cases of claim or debt, when one member may have a complaint against another for non-payment &c. the complainant shall state the matter, or have it brought on before the church to be settled by the acting members, or by a committee appointed for the purpose.

That the church covenant and constitution, and these rules and regulations to be read in church meeting twice a year; say, in May

and October, and oftener if circumstances appear to require it. The clerk to remind the church of this rule.

P. S. Baptism is here represented not as the means by which we actually receive pardon, justification and acceptance with God, but a declaration of our interest in these blessings.—Quere, Does it mean that the person baptised, does by his baptism declare his interest in these blessings, or that baptism declares it to him? If the latter, it is an admission (I concieve) of all we have ever contended for. You may perhaps render the Christian community a service by publishing this covenant, constitution and laws.

Yours in the Lord,
C. W. TALIAFERRO.

ON PRAYER AND SPECIAL INFLUENCE.

THE following communication from a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of high standing, with whom I have had the pleasure of an acquaintance for some years, though not written for the public eye, (esteeming it to be of public utility,) I take the liberty to lay before my readers. ED.

WELLSBURG, Va. March 20, 1833.

Dear Sir—

YOU are doubtless aware that your opponents charge you with denying the doctrine of *Spiritual Influence*, as it is held by most of the churches in Christendom, and as they think it is taught in the Word of God. Having promised some of my hearers a discourse on this subject, I was led to examine some of your writings in relation to Spiritual influence, that I might obtain more light, and fully understand your views.

In the second volume of the Millennial Harbinger, page 287, I find "a dialogue on the whole work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men." In this dialogue you say, "We plead that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the divine record;" and again you say, "If, then, the Spirit of God can communicate new light to any mind, it must be by new words or new verbal communications. Words, too, recollect, must be spoken, uttered, or written." From these sentences I infer that you suppose the word of God accomplishes its results over the minds of men in the same way as a system of mathematical truth or any other kind of truth does; or, to be more explicit, the New Testament, according to your views, is no more assisted by the Spirit which originally dictated it, than the mathematical works of Newton are by his spirit.

The converting power of the Principia of Newton is in the words he has written—the arguments he has offered; but his mind exercises no *special* agency over my mind while I read his book.

This, sir, I understand to be your view of the subject. If I have got your meaning, there is no difference between you and the cele-

brated Dr. Priestley on the subject of special aid or spiritual influence. I am not alone in giving this construction to your writings. Your friend W. Z. Thompson I think understands you as I do. He says, "If it be true, as you affirm, that faith comes alone by hearing or reading the testimony concerning Jesus, and that we have no right to expect any influence superinducing the mind to faith, or even causing the sinner to examine this testimony; I say, upon the supposition that these things are so, what right has any one to expect that God will answer his prayers in behalf of his unconverted friends?" This is a plain common sense question, which every pious mind will ask after reading your dialogue on the Holy Spirit. For it must appear evident that it is as absurd to pray for assistance from heaven in relation to our salvation, or to pray for the salvation of our friends, as to pray to the spirit of Newton that we may understand his works; or to Paley, or any other mental philosopher, that we may be able to practise his system of ethics.

You, however, attempt to show the propriety of prayer, according to your views of the divine government. What you have said is not satisfactory to me. You admit prayer to be a duty, a solemn and important duty; but you have not shown that there is no inconsistency between your opinions and what you admit to be your *duty*. You say, "We are commanded to pray for food, raiment, and health; but not to expect that the laws of nature are to be changed, suspended, or new-modified; or that we are to become the subjects of any supernatural aid in obtaining these things." If by "supernatural aid" you mean visible miracles, I agree with you; but, sir, is it not in the power of God *specially* to bless us without a *visible proof;* and does not our prayer suppose such an agency. I must say that if I believed that all events in the physical world are to be considered as the effects or results of the regular operations of the laws of nature, I should never pray for temporal blessings; because, with such views, prayer would be absurd—palpably absurd.

I know that some great philosophers and divines have held this opinion. It was advanced by Libnitz, the philosopher. But, sir, I. Newton and other able philosophers opposed his hypothesis, and he was not able to answer their arguments. If you suppose that all the events in the natural world are brought about by laws or fixed principles, I differ from you, and I demand proof.

You admit that nature is dependent on God, and cannot exist without him. To prove this you quote a very figurative passage of scripture; but in the conclusion of your explanation, you say, "And when we call on him for any favor for ourselves or others, we expect not that he will work a miracle to confer it; but that in subordination to these established arrangements he will bestow it." If by a miracle you mean a *visible interposition*, I agree with you; but if you mean by "established arrangements" laws previously established, when the world was made perhaps—I say it is an assumption, a *hypothesis*.

Some of your expressions in the first of your reply to W. Thompson, some of which I have quoted, appear to imply *nearly* all I contend

for; but when you come to speak of the way in which our prayers are answered when we pray for kings, and for our children and friends, you attribute no efficacy to prayer but what I shall call, for distinction's sake, natural influence. We pray for the king in the congregation: he hears of it, and concludes we are his friends. We pray for our children: they see and hear us. This affects them, and they are more inclined to be religious; or, to use your own words, "to receive instruction."

And is this, my dear sir, all the influence our prayers have? But, supposing the king should not hear that I pray for him, or my prodigal son should not be present at prayers, what influense would my prayers have? Just none at all. Now, dear sir, this is to me a meagre unscriptural view of prayer.

Your attempt to reconcile your practice with your theory is as unsuccessful as your predestinarian friend, to whom you allude. He says all things are *predestinated*—gives such a definition of predestination as effectually destroys our agency; but still says we *should* work. We say not, if his definition of decrees be correct; for we say we *must work*—we cannot help it. When we ask him to reconcile his *practice* with his *theory*, he frankly acknowledges that he cannot; but believes God can. But I do not believe God can or will reconcile absurdities.

That your views of Spiritual influence have a tendency to injure our devotional feeling is clear to my mind.

"Such opinions contradict our most natural sentiments, as well as the plain doctrine of Scripture, and tends to damp every act of devotion." So says a great Christian philosopher, and so I believe.

To conclude this hasty scroll, I believe that God *superintends* all nature. Matter and mind are under his control. He, as the poet says, "every where has sway;" some, many of the events of the physical and mental world, are brought about by *established laws.* Of this we have proof—philosophical proof. But many are brought about by *special agency*, and would not have happened had there been no immediate agency. That this is the case revelation supposes. My faith is founded in God's revelation.

Pardon me, dear sir, if I say that you have not, in my opinion, done this important subject justice. I hope you will review what you have written, and in some future essay place the subject before your readers in a more scriptural and philosophical light.

According to some of your statements, and a statement I heard one of your brethren make the other day in the Baptist church in Wellsburg, I am wholly at a loss to know how the Holy Spirit influenced the disciples on the day of Pentecost—how Peter and others, who were filled with the Spirit, spoke with strange tongues—and were all at once so wise in the things of the kingdom.

You say, and I understood your friend to say, "that the Spirit of God, in communicating light to the mind, does it by words or verbal communications."

"Words, too, must be *spoken, uttered,* or *written.*" I ask, what words were spoken to Peter by the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. We read of the appearance of cloven tongues, but we read of no voice. It is an assumption—and you might as well suppose that the Spirit of God could not move a solid body without a lever or machine, as to suppose that God has no way of giving us ideas but by words.

I am no advocate for a spiritual influence that supersedes the necessity of the word—I am not a Quaker in my views of God's agency in the government of *mind.* But I am a firm believer in a special providence, and in special agency. I could not be a Christian without this belief.

If I should oppose what I understand to be your views of Spiritual influence, and do it in the spirit of candor, I hope you will not think it inconsistent with friendship.

Yours sincerely, J. W.

REPLY.

Dear Sir,

I BELONG not to that school which regards the whole solar system as a piece of machinery somewhat like an eight day clock, which, after it was put together and wound up by its Maker, would just run on for one week of seven days, a thousand years each, without a single touch from the hand of its Maker:—I say, I cannot regard that great system of physical laws, called the material, or solar system, especially when made to be inhabited by rational, or voluntary agents, as detached from the superintendence of its Creator, as if he had no more concern with it. Nor can any process of reasoning which I have been able to institute, or which I have seen instituted by others, warrant me to conclude that the moral system to which we belong, though under the influence of moral laws, operating in a regular series of cause and effect, perhaps as unerringly as the physical laws of the material system, is so perfect as not to require the special notice, care and superintendence of the Father of spirits. Indeed, to me it is perfectly inconceivable how two systems, one of matter, the other of mind, so united, and yet so essentially distinct, could continue to move on for a single day without the providence of the great Author of the universe. Let us suppose a universe of only a million of voluntary agents, moving in all directions from any common center, impelled by a million of impulses, from without and within; and at the same time a million of involuntary agents, impelled by extrinsic law, in regular order, in fixed orbits, or channels, from which they never err, moving in the same area with the others,—would there not be perpetual jars, discords and clashings, until one class of agents was wholly annihilated? The *preservation* of the universe appears to me to require the exercise of the same wisdom, power, and goodness, which appear in its creation. As rationally might we attribute its creation, as its preservation, to secondary causes. If it be godlike to originate such a universe, it is godlike to sustain it.

But how this is done, is not to be comprehended by the creatures of yesterday. We know that there is an order of agents in this universe which are now, and have always been employed in the preservation of it. The angels are ministers of God; and now, under the Lord, are employed in the affairs of this system. They have power over things animate and inanimate. They can move both matter and mind. They can save and they can destroy. In answer to prayer, they have been sent in aid of our race.* "And when we cried to the Lord, he heard our voice, and sent an angel, and has brought us forth out of Egypt." Num. xx. 16. "And the angel of the Lord which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them." Ex. xiv. 19. An angel accompanied Eleazer of Damascus on his journey to Mesopotamia, where he went in quest of a wife for Isaac. Gen. xxiv. 7. An angel waited on Hagar, in the wilderness. Gen. xvi. 7. An angel counselled Paul, and rescued Peter from prison. But there is no need for specifications. It will be conceded by every student of the Bible, that angels have been employed in every sort of service to our race, from the birth of the world to the end of the New Testament. And that this ministry is yet continued, will appear evident to all who will carefully read the conversations at Samuel Goodal's, in this and the following number.

When, then, we pray to God for any special blessing, it is not for us to inquire how, or by what agency he will accomplish our desires. It is enough to know that he has agents to perform for us all that we can rationally desire, and that such agents have been employed in answer to prayer. For special purposes, he has special agents; and for general purposes, he has general laws.

All special providences are not what are commonly called miracles. But all miracles are special providences, or interpositions. Some special providences, indeed, all that are not visible and sensible miracles, are through the media of natural or moral causes. The salvation of Paul and his companions from shipwreck, was a special providence, yet there was nothing of what is commonly called miraculous in it. Herod was struck by an angel, yet the physicians would have said he died of the *morbus pecularis;* and in this light, perhaps, Josephus regarded it. How many suggestions, impulses, and motives, may be prompted by angels, good and evil, it would be difficult to imagine; but that both good and evil spirits have made suggestions, and have tempted men to good and evil, is very apparent from what is written by authority.

These hints are merely suggested in justification of our belief in special interpositions in answer to prayer. But that we are to expect any new spiritual light, or moral influence, independent of the moral means divinely instituted, is, to my mind, as fanatical as to look for loaves from heaven, or medicine from the clouds, in answer to prayer.

In this sentiment, my dear sir, we appear to be agreed. Your own experience will, I doubt not, concur with that of all sensible and re-

---

*See conversation after dinner, on New Year's day, at Samuel Goodal's. p. —.

flecting men who habitually call on the name of the Lord, in this capital position, that no new revelation, not a single new idea has, in answer to prayer, been communicated to any man since the apostolic age passed away. The testimony is complete; the love of God, his will, our duty, are perfectly developed. If any man can suggest to me a new thought, or a new idea, on any revealed subject, on any Christian principle, law, or institution, that is not to be found in the words and communications of the Holy Spirit now in our possession, I will engage to show that it is of no account in the affair of salvation, that it tends not to holiness or happiness.

This is no mere speculative matter; it is a practical view of revelation. It calls forth our devotion to the oracles. It leads to a constant attention to the communications of the Holy Spirit. It excites to diligence in searching the Scriptures. It induces us to search for the knowledge of God as for silver, to seek for it as for hidden treasure.

"But the mind of Newton exercises no special agency over the mind of the student of his principles." And why should he, unless he has not fully expressed his mind in said *Principia?* Grant it, you will say, and then does it follow that the mind of the Author of the gospel exercises no special agency over the mind of the student? If the cases be parallel, he does not. But I do not institute such a comparison. The converting power in morals is argument, argument is motive, and motive is idea, and idea is originated in the mind by words or signs. Now if the Spirit of God produces in the mind, apart from the word, any idea, it must be shown in the fact; it must be proved by the production of the idea. But who can produce such an idea? Not one.

But when and where was the promise made that the Spirit of God should exercise any special agency over the mind of the reader, or hearer of the Spirit? I have found, as yet, no such promise. Is it testified, any where, that the Spirit should exercise a special agency over its own word, or over the mind of any person in reading that word? I have not found it.

The advocates of an independent special agency over the mind of the reader, or hearer, have neither the testimony of God, nor any promise, for such an agency; nor can they produce any proof, in fact, of such an agency. I have never found it; and therefore, in the absence of all such evidence, I must contend that it is an assumption got up for explaining a theological or metaphysical difficulty.

But suppose that there is such an independent special agency, apart from the word, promised on any occasion, then it is the duty of all persons destitute of that agency, to seek it in the appointed way. Now if persons destitute of that agency must seek it, or must first believe the promise concerning it, and without it seek it, why can they not do without it altogether? I speak to the philosophers of this age, and in their own style. Some preachers,—and you know, my dear sir, they are not a few,—wish the people to believe that such an agency is necessary to faith, and that, consequently, those destitute of it,

are unable to believe;—yet they must believe in such an agency, and pray for it, without the power to believe, or the ability to ask!!

Amongst this unphilosophic and unscriptural class you would not be ranked. But a question must obtrude itself on the mind of all who have imbibed the notion of an independent, antecedent, or concomitant official agency, concerning the practical utility of such an idea. If persons are to believe and pray without it in order to obtain it, then do not they who contend for such a nondescript agency give it up in practice! *For cannot he who without it acceptably believes, and prays for it, acceptably believe and pray for any thing else proposed to the Christian? and if those without it are to be taught the necessity of it, it must be either to work despair in their minds, or to induce them, without it, to obtain it.*

So, then, there is nothing gained by those who differ from us on this subject. They wish their hearers to go to work without it, and not to wait for it, and we do the same. The difference, then, is in the consistency of the theory, not in the practice. Two advantages, however, we claim over all opposing theorists. We give to the testimony of God an importance, a power, a majesty, a spiritual energy, transcending very far the views of our opponents. We therefore fix the attention of all upon it, and we shut the door most effectually against fanaticism, Quakerism, and New-lightism of every name.

Circumstances have just at this moment caused me to break off in the midst of my reply. Please excuse my want of method in replying.

Very respectfully, and in all benevolence,

EDITOR.

Christian College.

NEW ALBANY, March 1, 1833.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

Dear Sir,

YOU once complained to me that the fountains of literary education were as much sectarian as the parties under whose auspices they were got up and patronized. You lamented that the youth of our country could no where obtain an education without the danger of becoming infidels or sectarians. I felt the force, because I knew the truth of it, at least in a limited sense; and from that day till now I have been endeavoring to excite an interest in the community in behalf of a literary institution free from those tendencies. I tried it in Ohio, and in Virginia, but without success. I have, however, made a successful effort in Indiana, and have actually succeeded in getting such an institution chartered. It is the most liberal in its provisions, and I hope to all the liberal-minded of the community, it will prove (what I sincerely wish it to be) a real and lasting benefit. A copy of the charter and the by-laws I herewith forward you, and hope they will meet your views. Will you please notice it in the Harbinger? We hope to go into operation soon after the April meeting. Can you attend with us?

In much affection, yours in the Lord,

JOHN COOK BENNET.

REPLY.

BROTHER BENNET,

Dear Sir,

YOURS of March 1st now lies before me. The intelligence it communicates was to me wholly unexpected. I heard nothing of this project until it was consummated. I had thought that your failure in Ohio and Virginia had broken your spirits in this enterprize, and that you had given it up. My remarks to you, to which you allude, were not made with a design to enlist you in such an enterprize: for you were then enlisted in it. And as the Christian religion has not much to expect from the literary institutions of this world, except so far as society at large is benefited by them, I never wished to see any institution got up for the purpose of aiding or abetting a cause which needs no such alliance, and which never has been directly benefited by such institutions. The gospel converts men of all ranks, casts, talents, and education, to God; and then their literature and talents and property are consecrated to the Lord. While, then, I have sometimes expressed myself as you have represented, it was rather from a wish to see these fountains of education divested of the power of doing harm to Christianity, than with an expectation or desire to see any one instituted expressly for its benefit.—Whether such an institution could be erected, is, with me at least, very problematical; and were it in its infancy to be a benefit, we have no evidence from any thing past that it could long continue so.

Your project, so far as it facilitates literary improvement, deserves well of the state. But the Christian church can never be made debtors to an institution which has never conferred on it any benefit. It would, upon the whole, have been more respectful to the judgment and wishes of the brethren to have consulted them on the propriety of such a scheme had circumstances permitted you: but I presume such was the pressure of events, that you had not time to confer with many of them upon the matter. It will no doubt be a question with some of them whether you ought not first to have had the concurrence of the Christian church, or "commonwealth of Christ," for whose "benefit" this institution is said to have been got up, before you proceeded in the affair, and to have ascertained whether they needed such an institution. But now that it is founded without such an expression of their will, it will remain for them to signify how far they can give it the countenance of their names and their funds. This is a question which neither you nor I ought to wish to decide for them. To enable them to judge advisedly in the case, I will lay before my readers the charter of said college:—

AN ACT

To incorporate the Christian College, at New Albany, Floyd county, Indiana.

Sect. 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana*, That John Cook Bennett, B. H. Miles, B. W. Stone, N. Field, F. E. Becton, S. Woodruff, C. Bosworth, M. Cole, W. Scott, J. Bledsoe, and their associates and successors in office, be, and are hereby constituted and declared to be a body corporate and politic, by the name and style of the "Christian College;" and by that name they shall have perpetual succession, with full power and authority to confer, or cause to be conferred, degrees; to contract and be contracted with; to acquire, hold, enjoy, and transfer property, real and personal, in their corporate capacity. *Provided*, That said corporation shall not own, at any one time, more than ten thousand dollars worth of real property. To make, have, and use a common seal, and the same to alter at pleasure; to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, in any court of law or equity; to receive and accept of any grant, gift, donation, bequest, or conveyance, by any person, company, or corporation, of any property, real or personal, and to hold, enjoy, and dispose of the same, as may be deemed best for the interest of said College; to elect a President and all such other officers, professors, instructers, tutors, and agents as they may think necessary for the benefit of said Univer-

sity; to make, ordain, establish, and execute such by-laws, rules, and ordinances, not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States, or of this state, as they shall deem necessary for the welfare of said institution; and to do all other acts in pursuance thereof, necessary for the prosperity of said University, and the promotion of scientific and literary objects connected with said College.

Sect. 2. The following shall be the fundamental laws of said institution, *to wit:* All elections shall be by ballot, and the majority of votes shall decide; and the majority of members present, at any meeting of the corporation shall govern in all other cases. There shall be four quarterly meetings of the corporation, *to wit:* Upon the last Wednesdays of January, April, July, and October, in each year, with power to continue from time to time, if the business requires it. A plurality shall form a quorum to do business at any meeting. No religious doctrine or tenets peculiar to any sect of professing Christians, shall ever be taught the students of said institution, as such, either directly or indirectly, by any of the professors, instructers, tutors, or members of the corporation, or any other person or persons connected therewith, under the penalty of immediate expulsion; and every member of the corporation, and every professor, and officer, and every person connected with the same, students excepted, shall take the following obligation before they enter upon the duties assigned them, which shall be administered by any person duly authorized to administer oaths in this state, *to wit*: You do solemnly affirm that you will well and truly discharge the duties assigned you, according to the best of your abilities, and that you will support the charter of the Christian College, under the pains and penalties of perjury,

Sect. 3. That John Cook Bennett shall be the first President, B. H Miles, the first Vice-President, B. W. Stone and M. Cole, the first Secretaries, and Seth Woodruff, the first Treasurer, who shall hold their offices until after the first meeting of the corporation, and until their successors are elected and qualified.

Sect. 4. The first meeting of said corporation shall be on some day in the months of January or February, eighteen hundred and thirty-three, as circumstances may suit. This act is declared to be a public act, and the same shall be construed favorably for every beneficial purpose therein intended.. *Provided, however*, That the Legislature reserves the right of altering or amending said charter at any time after the expiration of ten years.

Sect. 5. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and publication in the *Political Pioneer*, printed at Charlestown, Indiana.

JOHN W. DAVIS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
DAVID WALLACE,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 24th, 1833.

N. NOBLE.

The by-laws, and some remarks on them, must be postponed for another month.

I will just add, that however desirous I might be to visit New Albany in April next, it will be wholly out of my power to do so. I am for a long time most importunately invited to visit the North and East. These have prior claims. In the mean time adieu.

EDITOR.

The Jews.

IT has been customary in all Christian nations to regard and treat this unfortunate people as bad citizens. This is an unworthy and unfounded prejudice. In the recent siege of Antwerp, the gallant

defence of Fort St. Laurent was made by the 10th Dutch Regiment, composed chiefly of Jews. They behaved gallantly. In this country they are, in intelligence, worth, and patriotism, inferior to no class of our citizens. *Alexandria Gazette.*

A great number of religious Jews in Poland are making preparations to visit Jerusalem, in belief that the time predicted by their Prophets has nearly arrived in which they shall be restored to the possession of that country. The Jews generally are watching the movements of the Egyptian army with great eagerness, in the belief that some arrangements will be made which will enable them to return to Judea, and this belief has led to actual associations in Poland.

Richmond Whig.

Progress of Reform.

UNDER this head we have only room to state, that numerous documents are on hand; but they have been crowded out of the present number. We can only state that we had the pleasure, the other day, of receiving the first number of the *Christian Gleaner*, a periodical, issued in Halifax, N. S. devoted to the cause of reformation. The work is neatly executed—an octavo of 64 pages—four numbers to the volume—at *six shillings sterling* for one volume. The first number contains liberal extracts from the periodicals in this country, dedicated to reformation.——*Ed.*

Disappointments.

AFTER the *Family Testament* was out of press and in the hands of the book-binder, the engraver and printer of our maps failed in supplying them at the time expected. His failure was occasioned by the failure of the paper-maker in getting paper suitable for maps. Thus was one month lost. When we got a few maps to commence with, a book-binder, on whom we relied for finishing the work, failed in coming on according to agreement; and thus we have lost two weeks more. Meanwhile, through the sickness of the superintendant of our stereotype plates for the Pocket Testament, and the neglect of commission merchants, we have been detained six weeks in that work. And this same number of the Harbinger had likely not to appear at all in April, owing to a mistake of the paper-maker in furnishing us with a lot of paper too small for it. So that we have been quite ousted of all our calculations for the months of March and April. Thus when we have done our duty, the public are disappointed by a combination of circumstances over which we had no control. We are now recovering from these disappointments, and getting things into regular train. These failures delay my contemplated tour, which to me is no less a grievance than to the brethren who have solicited it. EDITOR.

A. W. CLOPTON, a distinguished preacher of Virginia, departed this life a few days since.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Number V.——Volume IV.

Bethany, Va. May, 1833.

To Charles Cassedy, Esq.

NO. IV.

DEAR SIR,

YOU have as much at stake as any man living in deciding whether Jesus of Nazareth was an impostor, or the Son of God and the only Savior of the world.—One, or the other, he certainly was. And, methinks, you will say, it would be rather miraculous if the author of the purest and most sublime system of morality and virtue which the world ever saw, should have been the most infamous impostor that ever appeared in human form. And this he was, if it be not true that "whosoever believes in him and is baptized, shall be saved," and whosoever disbelieves and rejects his salvation will be condemned. This was his last testimony, and this his last charge to the apostles. For alledging this he suffered death. And if the apostles are not the most impudent liars, after his resurrection and before his ascension, he commanded it to be promulged to you, and me, and all mankind.

Language has no meaning, and the apostles deserved to be put to death, and to be execrated by all the sons of men, if it be not true that whosoever despises and rejects the mediation of Jesus will be punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. Now, Sir, this being the fair and unvarnished state of the question, I put it to your intelligence and your candor, whether or not, it be not most worthy of every rational man to decide by all the lights of the volumes of creation, providence and redemption, whether a sinner—whether poor, weak, and short-sighted man, ought, or ought not, to commit himself into the hands of Jesus of Nazareth: to submit himself to his philosophy, logic, morality, and religion, rather than to his own wayward fancy, or the imagination of any man that ever appeared on earth.

This, my dear Sir, is the single question, on the decision of which, all depends. To decide this question in the affirmative makes the christian: to decide it in the negative, leaves us in this world without God, and without hope. And is that man rational or philosophic who can devote all his powers to the questions, what shall I eat, and drink, and

with what shall I be clothed; who can devote all his powers to the things of time and sense, while his future and eternal destiny is deferred to some more convenient season?

We are so constituted and so circumstanced, that our individual and personal happiness must be the paramount consideration. Now, was it not kind in our Creator to place us under an insuperable necessity of willing and seeking our own happiness? We may err in imagining the ways and means, but we are infallible in the wish to be happy. A man must unmake himself before he can will his own ruin. But if man be a rational or a free agent, he must have it in his power to ruin himself—or he could not have it is his power to be virtuous, pious, and happy. This, reason asserts; and we see it accords with our observation and experience, as well as with the oracles of the Great teacher.

Judge you then, is it wise, is it prudent to balance, or to outweigh the united testimony of apostles and prophets, of saints and martyrs, of the wisest and the best, for four thousand years, by our own artificial and imaginative difficulties? Shall we place in the one scale, the great luminaries of the world—the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles—the great moral revolutionists of our race—the splendid memorials of their genius, their inspiration, and their devotion to truth and humanity: I say, shall we place in the one scale the splendid monuments of the inspiration and philanthropy of all the independent authors of fifteen centuries, whose works are collected in the volumes called the Bible and Testament, and put in the opposite scale our own imaginations and fancies about how things might have been otherwise created or managed, and thus seek to counterpoise mountains with feathers? No, you reply, sooner will I reject the testimony of my own senses, that the sun is the fountain of light, because I cannot explain the meaning of those black or dark specks on its surface, than renounce Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, &c. &c., of the Jewish school; and Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter, Paul, and James, of the Christian school, as knaves and imposters, because they have not written upon geology, astronomy, chemistry, and the modern sciences;—or because they have not anticipated and answered every question which in six thousand years might be propounded by a thousand million of querists, speculating on what might have been done if the earth had been flat instead of round; or if man had had the wings of an eagle, and been sixty instead of six feet high, physically, mentally and morally!—Rather, you will say, let me stand in the ranks with prophets and apostles; with the saints and the martyrs; with the pure and holy men and women of all ages—with the Newtons, the Lockes, the Butlers, the Boyles, the Fergusons, the Bentleys, the Beaties, the Lardners, the Ushers, the Taylors, the Seldons, the Erskines, &c. &c., with those constellations of Poets that have sung, those orators that have defended, those philosophers that have demonstrated the claims of revelation, and those poor and humble, but virtuous millions, who have proved its consolations, and triumphed in its hopes, amidst all the

afflictions and trials, the sorrows and griefs, which have hitherto been the lot of the largest portion of our race. Yes, with these you will say, let me live and die, rather than with the Voltaires and the Volneys, the Mirabeaus and Altamonts, the Humes and the Paines, the Hobbes and the Chesterfields, the Dantons and the Robespierres, who boasted of reason and common sense, and shewed how little they had of either in renouncing the only light of the world and the only Saviour of men.

My dear Sir, this question,—Shall I or shall I not put myself under the guidance of Jesus the Messiah, is one of too much importance to be slighted by any man of good sense, of a sound and discriminating judgment. His promises and his threatenings are too momentous to be treated with indifference; his claims and his pretensions are too well supported, and too magnificent to be trifled with; and therefore, reason, if unbiassed and unbribed by the passions and the appetites, decides that this is the *immediate* duty which every man owes to himself and society. 'Tis to you and me, comparatively, of no consequence, who reigns on earth, if Jesus reigns in heaven; what policy is adopted by the state, if Jehovah has sworn by himself, that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, to the honor of Jesus who was crucified. We may be happy under a despotism, and wretched in the best republic. Our allegiance to Jesus as the great King is our felicity. our allegiance to his rival, be he on a golden throne, or be he seated in our passions, is our disgrace and ruin. If on his side all is well; if opposed to him we are undone forever. But, Sir, his religion has been greatly corrupted, and many of his professed friends have been his real enemies. The gospel has been made an engine of power in the hands of kings and priests, converted into a matter of state policy, made subservient to the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life. Several attempts at reformation, have within the last three centuries, introduced many important changes into society, but only since the beginning of the present century, has there been a vigorous effort made to reinstate the apostles and prophets on the seats assigned them by the author of the christian religion. The inquiry now is, what was the primitive gospel—the original order of things in the kingdom of Jesus? To these questions, more attention has been paid within the last thirty years, than since the great apostacy. In divesting the gospel and its institutions of the meretricious attire in which the mother of harlots had arrayed them, in leaving off the ceremonies, the doctrines and commandments of men, with which the pimps and panders of this insatiate adulteress have ministered to her lewdness, we have found the simplicity, intelligibility and suitableness of the gospel,and its institutions,to be truly astonishing, and admirably worthy of God. The light of the sun is not more admirably adapted to our eyes, or the sensible properties of things to our external senses, than is this message of our heavenly Father, suited to our nature, condition and circumstances. Well attested facts—facts of immense moral power—sustained by testimony which no honest and rational man, can, after full examination, doubt, constitute the materials of christian faith. This faith in testimony so supernatural and divine,

becomes the impulsive principle of action, leading men to reformation: and this belief in God's philanthropy leads us on to Jesus the Messiah as "the way, the truth, and the life"—and coming to him as our prophet, our only high priest, law-giver and judge, we receive in the first act of submission to him, the remission of all past sins—an adoption into his family, and the promise of his Holy Spirit, with the hope of eternal life, to which we shall certainly attain, provided we hold fast our allegiance to him, unshaken to the end. Why then, my dear Sir, should you, or any sensible man, hesitate on the question, whether it is more worthy of us to serve God than the Devil, or obey the gospel rather than our corrupt lusts:—Whether we ought to join the congregation of Apostles, Saints and Martyrs; the pure, and holy, and renowned fathers of mankind, the excellent of the earth of all ages and nations, or remain under the dominion of that spirit, which reigns in the hearts of the children of disobedience, in open communion with all the infidelity, scepticism and atheism of the Epicureans and Sadducees of this age. I know, indeed, that some are wont to look around and flatter themselves in their refusal to honor the Saviour, because of the respectability of many of their associates in rebellion against the Lord's anointed. But they forget that while here and there they can count up a few individuals of political integrity and honor, whose fraternity may do them some credit, still to the same communion belongs all the irreligionists of every shade of infamy, from Nero and Caligula and Heliogabulus, down to the veriest sensualist and debauchee that dishonors human nature. If, then, some sceptics and non-professors boast of some honorable and distinguished brethren, they ought to look around at the immense brotherhood of all that's filthy and abominable in the same great community with themselves, which constitutes what some call the big church. From this association, my dear Sir, I ardently desire to see such men as you divorced. You countenance and encourage many to adhere to their delusions, who, by your example, might be rescued from the snare of the Devil. And will you suffer such difficulties and embarrassments as would equally be against every thing rational and excellent in the election of man, to prevent you from honoring yourself, by honoring the Son of God, who has conferred such honors upon our race. For let me ask you—is there in the annals of the world, in all records and in all kingdoms, any system, or law, or tradition, which does such honor to our race, as does the Bible! Who assigns to man a more illustrious origin than Moses? Who proposes to him a sublimer destiny than Jesus? What system so rational, so pure, and so full of benevolence to man and adoration to God? At the head of what institution is there found one of such peerless excellency and glory, as he who redeemed the church, and governs it by the law of love? Who ought to feel ashamed of Jesus Christ in his earthly race to glory? And who ought to be ashamed of him, now the head of this Universe? Kings would do themselves infinite honor, in giving him the allegiance of their hearts, and in casting their crowns at his feet. To learn that such is your veneration for him, I assure you, would afford me great satisfac-

tion: incomparably more than to see you on the most renowned throne in the four quarters of the globe.

With sentiments of benevolence and high consideration,

I remain your friend,

EDITOR.

April 24th, 1833.

An Important Query---answered.

DAYTON, O. April 6th, 1833.

Brother Campbell,

IN the 3d volume, on the 143d page of the *Millennial Harbinger*, there is a very important *Query*, which has not, I believe, been yet answered. It reads as follows:—

"*How is it that when the ancient gospel has been fairly presented to a people, and the work of conversion progresses most joyfully for a time; after it arrives at a certain point it ceases; and afterwards in that place for some time conversions are rather rare?*"

In relation to this query, you say, "An answer to this question is requested from some of our correspondents who have been engaged in proclaiming the word. We will reserve our remarks until we hear from some who have been more in the field than we."

This request of yours, as well as the importance of the query, were, I thought, well calculated to elicit an answer; and hence I have been expecting one from the time of the publication of the query. The query certainly merits an answer: because it relates to a lamentable fact, the future existence and influence of which might be prevented by the instituting of a consistent course of conduct on the part of the reformers. This belief, as well as a desire to hear your sentiments in relation to the evil concerning which complaint is made in the query, I offer as an apology for presenting you at the present time with this paper.

The evil alluded to is an effect produced not by merely one, but many causes: and these causes are to be found partly among the enemies, and partly among the friends of reformation. I shall, therefore, proceed to speak of these causes, or rather some of them, as they have come under my observation at various times. The first cause of this evil which I shall mention, is—

1. *The prejudice of our opponents.*—This prejudice does not unusually bring forth its bitter fruits at any place until some time after the commencement of the preaching of the gospel at that place! Consequently, the gospel obtains a considerable weight of influence in many minds, enough to urge them into obedience, before our opponents can bring their artillery to bear against it. No sooner, however, do they perceive sinners in multitudes obeying the gospel, than they are aroused to action. Then follows almost every species of vituperation and misrepresentation. The doctrine which we preach is called by hard names; scraps of Scripture, wrested from their con-

nexion, are brought into requisition, by which to show the fallacies of our teaching; the antiquity and popularity of sectarian establishments are appealed to as divine establishments, while the ancient gospel is held up as a thing of yesterday; the aberrations of the members of our congregations are magnified and trumpeted; slander, with her thousand tongues, vilifies the public proclaimers; all these means are resorted to and used by one or another of our opponents, and not without effect! Many of the multitude are misled by them; others, although in despite of all the fiery darts of the wicked one, they continue to believe that we preach the true gospel, yet are not without a sufficiency of a certain kind of dubiety, and, in some instances, love of popularity, to prevent their submission to the gospel. Powerful, however, as are these means, they would fail of neutralizing the gospel, did they not find auxiliaries within the ranks of the reformation. Some of the auxiliary neutralizing causes found among us, are as follows:—

2. *Many of our public proclaimers have been too sarcastic and severe.* The writer of this article acknowledges himself to be implicated by this charge; but he has been endeavoring for some time to reform in this respect; not, he thinks, without success. Public proclaimers should be as conciliatory as the nature of the truth will permit. Love to all men should be in them a prominent characteristic. But if, instead of this, we indulge in the constant use of biting sarcasms against sectarians and sectarianism, we shall inevitably increase the quantum of the prejudice of our opponents instead of lessening it; and we shall meet thousands beyond the reach of our voices, and consequently beyond our influence, who, had we pursued a conciliatory course, would have heard us gladly, and would ultimately, under our ministry, have become the happy subjects of gospel conversion. We therefore say, that the severity and sarcasms of many of our preachers have constituted a part of the means by which the evil complained of in the query has been produced.

3. *The severity and sarcasms of many reformers who are not public proclaimers.* A preacher, if he is an influential one, is very apt to inspire his hearers with his own spirit, especially if it be a bad spirit! At any rate, we do know that there have been too much severity and sarcasm used by reformers, in conversation and controverted points. While the gospel has been bringing many into obedience, the people, as a matter of course, would take sides—some for, and some against the gospel as we preach it. Well, in many cases controversy between the contending parties waxed exceedingly warm, and many things were said on both sides calculated to hurt feelings, and to engender incurable prejudices; and the reformers, it may be, played their part in this war of words as warmly as did their opponents. What but mischievous prejudice and bitterness of spirit could be expected to result from this awful deviation from the genius of the Christian institution? If seriousness and love on the part of the reformers, such as Christianity demands, had always been used by them in their ad-

dresses to their opponents, the truth would have rolled onward like a mighty torrent; nor would all the vituperative and argumentative energies of anti-reformers been able to retard, much less to stop it. I say, *seriousness;* because when we converse with friend or foe on a subject so serious as is the subject of the Christian religion, solemn seriousness becomes us; nor can all our *witticisms* concerning *long-facedness*, alter, much less destroy the nature of this obligation.

4. *The reformers have frequently contributed to the production of the evil complained of in the query, by an unskillful use of the sword of the Spirit.* Nothing is more common than for young disciples, in private at least, to attempt the propagation of their sentiments before they themselves understand the Christian religion; and, in scores of instances I have known them advance most extravagant errors; which errors were immediately caught up and trumpeted by the opposition as fixed articles of our creed. Now, when young disciples, who are not well informed, permit themselves to circulate their fancies in this way, and to do so too in some cases with considerable asperity, what can they expect but to injure the cause of truth? The most of us are probably rather prone to give ourselves credit for more knowledge than we really possess; and hence liable to become inflated with a kind of spiritual pride. Young disciples should most assiduously court humility—not pride;—they should never suffer themselves to be puffed with a belief that they possess much spiritual knowledge, when indeed they have not advanced beyond the *Christian Alphabet!* Much injury has also been done in some congregations, by speakers who have not been careful to confine their discourses within the sphere of their knowledge; and who have consequently given to the people their own speculations and fancies instead of the word of the Lord. I am willing that all the brethren should teach in the congregations, who can teach so as to edify; but I do insist that no man should attempt to teach that which he does not himself understand. Teaching should by all be considered a matter of fact work. But if, when a speaker tells his congregation that he *goes* for facts, and blames in terms of awful severity the whole religious world for its speculations, it should be ascertained that he himself is as speculative as those whom he blames, what will the shrewd hearer say of him? Will he not say that the reformers are in in this respect as others—only they have a class of speculations peculiar to themselves? I do indeed think that if the brethren of our congregations would confine themselves on their First Day meetings to the breaking of bread, singing, prayer, exhorting one another to a holy life, and would have less to do with *chapter-commenting*, it would be infinitely better for us and for the world! We have done much harm by the unskillful use of the sword of the Spirit. But the mammoth evil, that which contributes more than all others to the obstructing of truth in its progress, is—

5. *That reformers do not, in their every day deportment, conform, with sufficient strictness, to the Christian religion.* We have by profession taken an elevated stand. We call ourselves Christians, New

Testament Christians, Reformers, &c. We proclaim these things abroad every where. The world is consequently on *tiptoe* to see what holy livers, what paragons of Christian purity these reformers are going to be! Now, suppose that after they shall have looked on us for some time, and with good intention too, they should be puzzled to tell in what kind of holy living we excell our neighbors; think you it would not have a tendency to keep them at a distance from us? The more so, as we have made so much ado about practical reformation. Tens of thousands of non-professors are now sick of the immoralities and impurities of sectarian churches, and are looking towards us with intense solicitude, hoping to behold in us what they have long desired to see—a congregation of faithful men and women, holy, harmless, undefiled—walking in the truth! O! shall we not drive them into infidelity if we do not permit them now to behold in us *the peaceable fruits of righteousness?* We do know that the shortcomings of reformers have had, in many places, an immense, and a deleterious influence upon the people of the world. We will not say that in such instances no injustice has been done to our cause by the people of the world. In converting sinners, and constituting churches, we are dependent upon the world for materials; and really many of these materials have been so spoiled in and by the world, before ever the gospel found them, that we can make nothing of them that will redound to the credit of the Christian religion! For this reason I do not think that the people of the world do either themselves or us justice, when they blame either the Christian religion or the church for the aberrations of those dishonest and depraved beings whose moral maladies are beyond the reach of the gospel *materia medica!* Many of the people of the world seem to excuse their own disobedience by pleading the disobedience of professors—just as if *two wrongs*, one in themselves and one in a professor, would make *one right!!* But so it is; and it ought to make us all more circumspect.

I have merely hinted at what I consider the chief causes of the evil lamented in the query. It will remain for the public to judge whether my answer is true or false. If it shall be of no further benefit, it may attract attention to the point to which the query relates, and eventuate not only in eliciting information from other men more competent than the writer of this article, but in the removal, to some extent, of those evils upon which I have animadverted. But this paper ought not to be closed, without saying that however great may be the evils which we deplore, the reformation carries with it much sterling virtue—much pure and undefiled religion—much native talent and high intellectual endowments; and as its advocates have put themselves under a *divine church discipline*, one made for them by Jesus Christ—the New Testament, we may expect that the evils of which we complain will be perpetually, though perhaps imperceptibly diminished; and that ultimately the truth, either by its own efficacy, or by collateral supernatural aid, will obtain a complete and never-to-be-forgotten triumph. May the Lord grant it!

Yours, A. RAINES.

Where is there a Primitive Church?

THE views of this writer may be somewhat exaggerated—he may propose a model which would unchurch every church in the New Testament, save the one on which he comments. I say this is possible, but yet it is not to be lost sight of, that, to a high degree, the things which he expects from a church of such a profession, must, in a good degree, be found in every church worthy of skillful application of causes as will produce such effects as unguided the faith of the original gospel and order of things. EDITOR.

Dear Sir, April, 1833.

BY way of mental refreshment, the other day I read over the first written letter of the Apostle to the Gentiles, and the question arose in my mind, "*What are the marks of ministerial usefulness?*" If you consider the following to be a true reply, be kind enough to insert it in your next Harbinger.

1. That the word preached exerts a divine power, through the Holy Spirit, filling the hearers with abundant assurance. The *power* is known to be divine from the practical effects, viz.—a *working* faith, a *laborious* love, and a persevering and increasing progress in all the efforts of godliness, sustained by the "hope" of eternal life.

2. That the hearers become "imitators" of the Apostle Paul, in his self-denials, zeal, and "afflictions" for the gospel' sake; and in being filled with holy spiritual "joy," tribulations notwithstanding.

3. That the *professors* be influenced by his teaching, to cause the joyful sound to be heard in all the surrounding country—as widely, indeed, as their means can possibly carry it—so that the population all around them shall speak of them as a people redeemed from "idols," "the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life"—and as being in the attitude of expectants of "Christ's second coming."

4. That the preacher should be shamefully handled for his "bold" fidelity—the truth, purity, and plainness of his doctrine—his manifest aim to please a heart-searching God, and not men—his refusing to modify or withhold the truth from a wish to flatter men, and for the love of money—his fleeing from the honor that cometh from men, whether they be of the world or of the church—and his inflexible adherence to this course, though it be attended by the bitterest persecutions.

5. That the *professors* should conduct themselves affectionately and respectfully towards him, as well educated children towards a parent; so that their intercourse is of the most confidential, tender, and loving character.

6. That his instructions and exhortations to holiness and conformity to the perfections, example, and character of Christ, shall be of the most noble and *elevated* description; *and yet*, by the professors so gladly "embraced," and fully complied with, that the teacher's employment and privilege shall be that of "giving God thanks without ceasing" on account of their obedience.

7. That, in short, the results and fruits of his labors among the people, shall constitute an *exemplification* of the gospel axiom, "The word of God worketh effectually in them that believe."

8. That in their social, congregational, or church capacity, they shall resemble the first planted congregations, (in Judea for instance,) in their order, institutions, and sufferings—and in patient endurance of hardness for the hope of the gospel. And lastly, that in the discharge of all relative duties, and in the cultivation of the fruits of the spirit of goodness, they shall be a people of whom the teacher could "glory"—as destined to prove and establish the soundness of *his* hope, of a crown of rejoicing, in the presence of Christ the Judge!

Now, sir, when these effects are produced, the religious teacher has an attested *call* to the ministry. He has been useful to the people. They are manifestly "the election of grace." They are Christ's brethren; saved by the wisdom of God, and the power of God; and are become joint heirs with Christ and all saints, of the glory of the one body, and "the fulness of him who filleth all in all." To understand the value of the labors of the present generation of clergy, and religious proclaimers of every grade, it is only necessary to compare their disciples, of *all* denominations, with the foregoing scriptural characteristics. Do the churches, in any true sense, resemble the New Testament portrait? Who that has a decent measure of self-respect dare answer in the affirmative? The Saviour teaches us to ascertain the valuable and the worthless among religious leaders, as we estimate the character of fruit trees—"By their fruits shall ye know them." It is of no weight to plead that the man teaches truth, and is besides a pious, moral individual himself: if the scriptural attainments and qualities are not possessed by the people under his care, or moulded by his influence, whether by speech or printing;—they are not *savingly* profited. Names or nicknames are nothing—the pretensions and professions of men, or sects, are nothing. Whether it be among Romanists or Reformers, if the professing disciples do not agree to the standard, which the word has erected, they are not SAVED!

The country is full of *evangelical* preachers—and of *churches* claiming to be pure, primitive, and *apostolic* in origin and order—and there is no lack of *devout* professors—that is, believers of the gospels (gospels?) they read or hear—and what is the profit? Look at the religious world, in the light of the New Testament, and say, have these professors realized the great salvation!? Are they manifestly the "imitators" of the meek and lowly Jesus? Are they willing to be POOR, *despised*, unknown in the world, and by the world? Do they understand the *fact* that the Son of the Highest laid down his life for them, because they are conscious of a readiness to lay down their own lives, if necessary, for their brethren in the same church? Why, sir, you know, that if it were not a most solemn and awful theme, the question taken in connexion with the existing facts, would be ridiculous—that is to say, their religion is a caricature, and their hope is the baseless fabric of a deluded imagination. But I will not further specify, as the sentiment may be expressed in a few words. I ask, then, *Where is the body of people, on this continent, that can look the New Testament in the face, and not be sensible, that "if the Word means*

what it says," *they have not, as yet, been* SUBJECTED *to the effectual, sanctifying, and* ALL-*subduing power from on high?* Yea, the *Prophets* are not profitable to them, to the extent of a salvation for eternity—they have employed an instrument, which is *not* of God, because the divinely described and required effects do not follow its use. The people are moralized, and civilized, and humanized, &c. but all *that* is eternally distinct from creating a "new man" who is "righteous AS Christ is righteous."

I remain, dear sir, yours, &c.

AN INDEPENDENT BAPTIST.

Good Friday.

CINCINNATI, March 19, 1833.

To the Rev. Dr. Joshua L. Wilson.

SIR—

IN your lecture of the afternoon of to-day (Sunday, March 17,) you quoted a passage of the Sacred Scriptures in the following extraordinary, and, I must say, Jesuitical manner:—

"Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God—I may as well give the whole," (you continued, as if your conscience accused you at the time of handling the word of God deceitfully)—"Except a man be born of water, or of the word of truth, as I [Dr. Joshua Wilson] take it, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

In a subsequent part of your lecture you remarked—

"Inasmuch as the churches have access to the Scriptures through the medium of translations only, that church is most happy which has the best translation, containing the nearest import of the words originally used by the inspired writers."

Now, reverend sir, I beg leave to ask you the following questions founded on the foregoing citation from your lecture:—

1. Does not the Greek word *hudoor* signify, literally, substantially, and simply, *water;* and do not all words compounded with it signify something in relation to water; and is it not used in this common acceptation by all Greek authors, both sacred and profane?

2. Is not the same word, *hudoor,* used for water in the following passage:—"Having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and the body washed with clean water, *hudati katharoo?*" Hebrews x. 22.

3. Does it not also occur in the following text:—"The long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved *by water,* (*hudatos;*) the like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us"? 1 Peter iii 20.

4. Is not the phrase *genneethee* EX HUDATOS *kai Pneumatos,* be born of water and of the Spirit, that used in the quotation you cited?

As an observation on this question, I would say, that the words *ex hudatos* ought to be translated OUT *of the water.* The preposition *ex* or *ek,* which are convertible particles, has three definite significations, as, *out of, from, after;* thus—

Aias ek Salaminos agen neeas.——*Homer.*
[Ajax brought ships *out* of Salamis.]

Now if we refer to the original, and read the text literally, we shall see a beauty in the passage which the translation does not develope; and considerable light will also be shed over the question of Nicodemus, "How can a man be born when he is old?" It reads thus: "Except a man be born out of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Hence, Dr. Wilson, you

perceive that in order to be born again, or regenerated, it is necessary to pass *under* the influence of two things, which must not be separated; namely, *of the water and the Spirit;* for a man cannot come *ex* out of the water, or, as our Savior expresses it, "be born out of water," except he first *enter* EIS *into it.* Doctor, you see your dilemma. Have you been born out of water *and* the Spirit? Let conscience answer. If you have not, you cannot enter the kingdom, even though you shall have cast out devils in the name of Christ. Do not say that I separate the water and the Spirit; no! what God hath joined let no man put asunder, even should it tend to the *bouleversement* of his creed. There is but *one* baptism consisting of water and Spirit. Thus you perceive that this law of naturalization, instituted by Christ, very accurately defines the boundary line between the kingdoms of light and darkness—between the territory of the Prince of this world and that of the Prince of peace. Mind, Doctor, "you *must* be born again" in the way appointed by Christ the lawgiver of his kingdom; Christ himself says so, and it must be in the way that he has instituted. I know *"the church"* has established another way of being born again, or regenerated; but Christ is above the church; and to any man, be he priest or layman, who shall obey the church. *or men,* rather than Christ, whose will we can only learn by his word, and not by the interpretation of any set of men, it shall be said by the righteous Judge of all, "Depart from me, for I never knew you." Remember, Doctor, that "not every one that *saith* unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven." He must do that which Christ told Nicodemus he must do—he must be born again, and in the way he had shown him. Paul says not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the *doers* of the law shall be justified; and James exhorts the scribes to be "doers of the word and not hearers only, deceiving their own selves."

5. What is *"the will of the Father"*—*"the law"*—and *"the word?"*

Was it not the code of the kingdom given by Christ, of which one law was, that none should enter the kingdom of God except they were born *ex hudatos* out of water and the Spirit? This I apprehend, is one of the important decrees which went forth out of Zion, and which, Reverend Doctor, you took upon you to mutilate and corrupt in the lecture referred to. You said, truly there is a sin against the Holy Spirit which shall not be forgiven. Take care, take care, Rabbi Wilson, lest the plagues spoken of in the book be added unto you for adding to and taking from the word of God!

6. Seeing, then, that the same word is used in all these instances, by what authority, human or divine, classical or otherwise, do you presume to *"take"* the word *hudoor,* or *water,* as meaning *"the word of truth?"*

If you translate it thus in one of these passages, you must do so in all. The Scriptures speak sense, and were written by men of good understandings under the dictation of the Holy Spirit. But, according to your version, you make them talk nonsense, and reduce the whole to an absurdity. For example, your translation would read thus: Except a man be born of the pure word of truth and of the Spirit, &c. You know what James says, (ch. i. v. 18.) *"Of his own will begat he us."* How did the Father beget us? The Apostle replies, *"With the word of truth."* Now as *to beget* does not signify *to be born,* this cannot refer to the new birth or being born out of water—we are *"begotten* by the word" and *born* out of water and Spirit; or, in other words, regenerated.

Again—"Having the body *washed* with the pure *word* of truth." Washing the body with words!

While the ark was preparing eight souls were saved by the pure word of truth, &c. An ark floating on the waters of the deluge, with eight persons, besides a large number of clean and unclean beasts, with stores for many months; according to you, learned sir, should be read, *An ark floating upon the pure word of truth,* &c. By what law of hydrostatics such a flotilla could *swim on true words,* I am utterly at a loss to conceive! Joshua L. Wilson, D. D. can perhaps explain.

I agree with you that that assembly of Christians is much blessed, where the word of God is interpreted. But really I do think (judging from the spe-

cimen with which you have favored us of your philological exegesis) your congregation has no claim to that beatitude. Nothing can be more simple than that to be born again, or regenerated, consists in being "born out of water and the Spirit." This hydropneumatic baptism, if I may be allowed the expression, is very aptly compared to a burial and resurrection. When a man dies and is buried, and comes to life again, he is very correctly said to be born again, or "*to arise to newness of life.*" When a man becomes dead to the world, nothing is so natural as that he should be "buried with Christ in" this hydropneumatic "baptism;" or, in plain English, baptism composed of water and spirit. He disappears for a time from the eye of sense, he is in the womb of water as the dead are in the womb of the grave. When he re-appears he enters into the kingdom of God out of this hydropneumatic tomb; and as our Lord was born, or rose out of, or from, the Jordan, or waters of death, into the kingdom of heaven; so he was born or rose out of, or from, "the laver of regeneration," through which he entered into the kingdom of God. How beautiful the analogy! how sublime the figures!

Doctor, you darken counsel by words without knowledge. It is such teaching as yours that has led mankind astray. Priestcraft and monachism first subdued the independence of the human mind, and taught it to trust its spiritual concerns to a set of men, whom God, it was said, had appointed to think for it. The Reformation *but partially* knocked off these fetters. The Morning Star of that memorable day soon began to wane; and has been fast sinking behind the clouds of human tradition and devices, which you, Doctor, contribute in generating to the darkening of the truth, and the perversion of the *right use* of reason; and unless a miracle be wrought to prevent it, it bids fair to set in the haze of indifference, lukewarmness, fanaticism, and infidelity.

The Scriptures are written that they may be understood, not perverted. Their style is plain, simple, easy and intelligible. They mean what they say, and have *no secret or private interpretation.* When they speak of water they mean water, and of spirit, spirit. But you make them mean what they do not say; thus you teach the traditions of men for the commandments of God.

Excuse me when I say you paid your hearers no compliment, and gave them very little credit even for common intelligence, when you paraphrased the scriptures as described. For my own part I felt the manner in which you glossed over the word of truth an insult to my understanding; and had it not been for the sake of decorum, I should have taken my hat and walked.—What! "a minister of the gospel," as you style yourself, and manifest such want of candor—such disingenuousness! But, alas for your hearers! I could see plainly you were bound by the square rule of your creed, which seemed susceptible in your own view of mathematical demonstration. Take the advice of one, though in youth, and a layman too. Throw away your creeds, school divinity, and catechisms; they are all human inventions, first devised by the worse than Pagan Church of Rome as a substitute for revelation; take the Scriptures, acknowledge no authority but them, for they contain the mind of God; search them, and make them explain themselves; fear not to declare the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, even though it should lead you to proclaim "one Lord, one faith, one baptism for the remission of sins." Acts ii. 38.

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

Sherlock on Divine Providence.

Brother Campbell,

IT is supposed by many that the time is fast approaching, and not very far distant, when Atheism will prevail over the earth, and openly exalt itself against the government of the Most High. They believe it to be the last of those great unholy influences, by which

man is to be led to rebel against his Creator; and they consider it nothing but the ultimate and natural result or effect of false and wicked government, and corrupted religion, to produce a total disbelief in the providence and existence of God, and the truth of religion and revelation. The rapid increase of scepticism and infidelity of late years would seem to give some probability to these expectations; but among the signs of their approaching fulfilment, there is, perhaps, no circumstance more worthy of attention than that disposition which now so generally prevails among even the professors of religion, to explain every thing that occurs upon rational principles, and to attribute even the most striking events to the common and ordinary operation of natural causes. I have lately met with *Sherlock on Providence*, and have been much pleased with the able and scriptural arguments by which he exposes this prevalent error; and I have thought it would be useful and acceptable to the readers of the Harbinger to have before them the following extracts:— R.

Next to *preservation*, as that signifies God's upholding all things in being, and preserving and actuating their natural powers, we must consider God's government of the world. For God is the supreme and sovereign Lord of the world, *who doeth whatsoever pleaseth him both in heaven and in earth;* and therefore the absolute government of all things must be in his hands, or else something might be done which he would not have done.

This all men grant in general words, who own a Providence; but when they come to particulars, there are so many excepted cases, which they will hardly allow God to have any thing to do in, that they seem to mean little more by God's government than a general inspection of human affairs, his looking on to see the world govern itself; for three parts of four of all that is done in the world they resolve into bare permission as distinguished from an ordering and disposing providence; and then it can signify no more than that God does not hinder it. And if this be all, God governs the world in such cases no more than men do. The only difference is, that God can hinder when he does not; but men do not hinder because they cannot; but still not to hinder does not signify to govern.

But rightly to understand this matter, the best way is to consider how the Scripture represents it; and because there are great variety of acts in the government of the world of a very different consideration, I shall distinctly inquire into God's government of causes, and his government of events.

1. God's government of causes. And we must consider three sorts of causes, and what the Scripture attributes to God with respect to each. 1st. Natural causes. 2d. Accidental causes, or what we call chance, and accident, and fortune. 3d. Moral causes and free agents, or the government of mankind.

1st. Natural causes, or God's government of the natural world, of the heavens, and earth, and seas, and air, and all things in them which move and act by a necessity of nature, not by chance. Now

the Scripture does not only attribute to God all the virtues and powers of nature which belongs to creation, and to a preserving Providence, but the direction and government of all their natural influences to do what God has a mind should be done. God does in some measure govern the moral by the natural world. He rewards or punishes men by a wholesome or pestilential air, by fruitful or barren seasons. He hinders or promotes their designs by winds and weather, by a forward or a backward Spring, and makes nature give laws to men, and sets bounds to their passions and intrigues; to overthrow the most powerful fleets and armies; to defeat the wisest counsels, and to arbitrate the differences of princes, and the fate of men and kingdoms. And if God govern men by nature, he must govern nature too; for necessary causes cannot be fitted to the government of free agents without the direction and management of Divine Providence, which guides, exerts, or suspends the influences of nature with as great freedom as men act. Men do not always deserve well or ill; and if the kind or malign influences of nature must be tempered to men's deserts, to punish them when they do ill, and to reward them when they do well, natural causes, which of themselves act necessarily without wisdom or counsel, must be guided by a wise hand.

Thus reason tells us it must be if God govern the world, and God challenges to himself this absolute and sovereign empire over nature. God has bestowed different virtues and powers on natural causes, and in ordinary cases makes use of the powers of nature, and neither acts without them nor against the laws of nature, which makes some unthinking men resolve all into nature without a God or a Providence. Because excepting the case of miracles, which they are not willing to believe, they see every thing else done by the powers of nature. And if it were not so, God had made a world and made nature to no purpose, to do every thing himself by an immediate power, without making use of the powers of nature. But the ordinary government of nature does not signify to act without it or to overrule its powers, but to steer and guide its motions to serve the wise ends of his providence in the government of mankind.

For as God does not usually act without nature, nor against its laws, so neither does nature act by steady and uniform motions without the direction of God. But while every thing in the material world acts necessarily and exerts its natural powers, God can temper, suspend, direct its influences, without reversing the laws of nature. As, for instance, fire and water, wind and rain, thunder and lightning, have their natural virtues and powers, and natural causes, and God produces such effects as they are made to produce by their natural powers. He warms us with fire—invigorates the earth by the benign influences of the sun and moon, and other stars and planets; refreshes and moistens it with springs and fountains and rain from heaven—fans the air with winds, and purges it with thunders and lightnings, and the like. But then when and where the rains shall fall and the winds shall blow, in what measure and proportion, times and seasons natural causes shall give or withhold their influences

this God keeps in his own power, and can govern without altering the standing laws of nature; and this is his government of natural causes in order to reward or punish men as they shall deserve. Thus God reasons with Job concerning his power and providence. Job xxxviii. 31, 32, &c. *"Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season, or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons? Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven, or canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth? Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds that abundance of waters may cover thee? Canst thou send lightnings that they may go and say unto thee, Here we are?"* This is above human power, but belongs to the government and providence of God. "Fire and hail, snow, and vapor, and stormy winds fulfil his word." Psalm cxlviii. 8. Sometimes God restrains the influences of nature, "shuts up heaven that it shall not rain." 2 Chron. vii. 13. And at other times he "calls to the clouds that abundance of water may cover the earth. He gives the former and the latter rain in its season, and preserveth to us the appointed weeks of harvest." Jer. v. 24. as he promised to Israel, (Deut. xi. 14, 15.) "I will give you the rain of your land in due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine and thy oil; and I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full." He prescribes in what proportions it shall rain, (Joel ii. 23, 24.) "Be glad, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God; for he hath given you the former rain moderately, and he will cause to come down for you the former rain and the latter rain in the first month." Nay, God appoints on what place it shall rain, (Ezek. xxxiv. 26.) "And I will make thee and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the flower to come down in his season; there shall be flowers of blessing." Amos iv. 7, 8. "And also I have withholden the rain from you when there were yet three months to the harvest. And I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city. One piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not withered; so two or three cities wandered to one city to drink water, but they were not satisfied."

It is impossible to give any tolerable account of such texts as these, without confessing that God keeps the direction and government of all natural causes in his own hands. For particular effects, and all the changes of nature can never be attributed to God, unless the divine wisdom and counsel determines natural causes to the producing such particular effects. Great part of the happiness or miseries of this life is owing to the good or bad influences of natural causes. That if God take care of mankind he must govern nature; and when he promises health and plenty, or threatens pestilence and famine, how can he make good either if he have not reserved to himself a sovereign power over nature?

The sum is this, that all natural causes are under the immediate and absolute government of Providence—that God keeps the springs of nature in his own hands, and turns them as he pleases. For mere

matter, though it be endowed with all the natural virtues and powers which necessarily produce their natural effects; yet it having no wisdom and counsel of its own, cannot serve the ends of a free agent without being guided by a wise hand. And we see in a thousand instances what an empire human art has over nature—not by chang ing the nature of things, which human art can never do; but by such skilful application of causes as will produce such effects as unguided, and, if I may so speak, untaught nature could never have produced. And if God have subjected nature to human art, surely he has not exempted it from his own guidance and power.

This shows how necessary it is that God, by an immediate providence, should govern nature. For natural causes are excellent instruments; but to make them useful they must be directed by a skilful hand. And those various changes which are in nature, especially in this sublunary world, (which we are most acqnainted with) without any certain and periodical returns, prove that it is not all mechanism; for mechanical motions are fixed and certain, and either always the same or regular and uniform in their changes.

It is of great use to us to understand this, which teaches us what we may expect from God; and what we must attribute to him in the government of nature. We must not expect in ordinary cases that God should reverse the laws of nature for us; that if we leap into the fire it shall not burn us; or into the water, it shall not drown us. And by the same reason the providence of God is not concerned to preserve us when we destroy ourselves by intemperance and lust; for God does not work miracles to deliver men from the evil effects of their own wickedness and folly. But all the kind influences of heaven which supply our wants, and fill our hearts with food and gladness, are owing to that good providence which commands nature to yield her increase; and those disorders of nature which afflict the world with famines, and pestilence, and earthquakes, are the effects of God's anger and displeasure, and are ordered by him for the punishment of a wicked world. We must all believe this, or confess that we mock God when we bless him for a healthful air and fruitful seasons, or deprecate his anger when we see the visible tokens of his vengeance in the disorders of nature. For did not God immediately interpose in the government of nature, there would be no reason to beg his favor, or to deprecate his anger upon these accounts.

2d. Let us consider God's government of accidental causes, or what we call chance and accident, which has a large empire over human affairs. Not that chance and accident can do any thing, properly speaking, (for whatever is done has some proper and natural cause which does it;) but what we call accidental causes, is rather such an accidental concurrence of different causes, as produces unexpected and undesigned effects: as when one man, by accident, loses a purse of gold, and another man, walking the fields, without any such expectation, by as great an accident, finds it. And how much of the good or evil that happens to us in this world, is owing to such undesigned, surprising, accidental events, every man must know who has

made any observations on his own or other men's lives and fortunes. The wise man observed this long since, (Eccles. ix. 11.) "I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong; neither yet bread to the wise; nor yet riches to men of understanding; nor yet favor to men of skill: but time and chance happeneth to them all." Some unusual and casual events change the fortunes of men, and disappoint the most proper and natural means of success. What should conquer in a race but swiftness; or win the battle but strength? What should supply men's wants and increase riches, but wisdom and understanding in human affairs? What more likely way to gain the favor of princes and people, than a dexterous and skilful application and address? And yet the preacher observed in his days, and the observation holds good still, that it is not always thus: *time and chance*, some favorable junctures, and unseen accidents, are more powerful than all human strength, or art, or skill.

Now what an ill state were mankind in, did not a wise and merciful hand govern what we call chance and fortune? How can God govern the world, or dispose of men's lives and fortunes, without governing chance, all unseen, unknown and surprising events, which disappoint the counsels of the wise, and in a moment unavoidably change the whole scene of human affairs? Upon what little unexpected things do the fortunes of men, of families, of whole kingdoms turn! And unless these little unexpected things are governed by God, some of the greatest changes in the world are exempted from his care and providence.

This is reason enough to believe, that if God governs the world, he governs chance and fortune; that the most unexpected events, how casual soever they appear to us, are foreseen and ordered by God.

Such events as these are the properest objects of God's care and government, because they are very great instruments of Providence. Many times the greatest things are done by them, and they are the most visible demonstration of a superior wisdom and power which governs the world. By these means God disappoints the wisdom of the wise, and defeats the power of the mighty; "frustrateth the tokens of the liar, and maketh diviners mad; turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish." Isa. xliv. 25. Did strength and wisdom always prevail, as in a great measure they would were it not for such unseen disappointments; mankind would take less notice of Providence, and would have less reason to do it, since they would be the more absolute masters of their own fortunes. A powerful combination of sinners, managed by some crafty politicians, would govern the world; but the uncertain turnings and changes of fortune keep mankind in awe, make the most prosperous and powerful sinners fear an unseen vengeance, and give security to good men against unseen evils, which cannot befall them without the order and appointment of God.

That there are a great many accidental and casual events, which happen to us all, and which are of great consequence to the happiness or miseries of our lives, all men see and feel. That we cannot defend

ourselves from such unseen events, which we know nothing of till we feel them, is as manifest as that there are such events; and what so properly belongs to the divine care, as that which we ourselves can take no care of? The heathens made fortune a goddess, and attributed the government of all things to her *tuche kuberna panta;* whereby they only signified the government of providence in all casual and fortuitous events; and if Providence govern any thing, it must govern chance, which governs almost all things else, and which none but God can govern. As far as human prudence and foresight reach, God expects we should take care of ourselves; and if we will not, he suffers us to reap the fruits of our own folly; but when we cannot take care of ourselves, we have reason to expect and hope that God will take care of us. In other cases human prudence and industry must concur with the divine providence in matters of chance and accident, providence must act alone and do all itself, for we know nothing of it; so that all the arguments for providence do most strongly conclude for God's government of all casual events.

And the Scripture does as expressly attribute all such events to God, as any other acts of providence and government. In the law of Moses, when a man killed his neighbor by accident, God is said to deliver him into his hands. Exod. xxi. 12, 13. "He that smiteth a man so that he die, shall be surely put to death. And if a man lie not in wait, but God deliver him into his hands, then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee:" where "God's delivering him into his hands" is opposed to him "that smiteth a man so that he die," and "to him that comes presumptuously upon his neighbor to slay him," (15th verse,) and therefore signifies one who kills his neighbor by mere accident, as it is explained in Deut. xix. 4, 5. "And this is the case of the slayer that shall flee thither," (i. e. to the city of refuge;) "whoso killeth his neighbor ignorantly, whom he hated not in time past,—as when a man goeth into the wood with his neighbor to hew wood, and his hand fetcheth a stroke with the axe to cut down the tree, and the head slippeth from the helve, and lighteth upon his neighbor that he die,—he shall flee unto one of these cities, and live." What can be more accidental than this? And yet we are assured that that this is appointed by the divine providence; that God delivers the man who is killed into the hands of him that killed him.

Is any thing more casual than a lot? And yet Solomon tells us, "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord," (Prov. xvi. 33;) which is not confined to the case of lots, but to signify to us that nothing is so casual and uncertain, as to be exempted from the disposal of Providence. For what seems accidental to us, is not chance, but providence—is ordered and appointed by God to bring to pass what his own wisdom and counsel has decreed; as is very evident from some remarkable instances of providence which are recorded in Scripture.

By how many seeming accidents and casual events was Joseph advanced to Pharaoh's throne? His dreams, whereby God foretold his advancement, made his brethren envious at him, and watch some

convenient opportunity to get rid of him, and so confute his dreams. Jacob sends Joseph to visit his brethren in the fields, where they were keeping their sheep. This gave them an opportunity to execute their revenge, and at first they intended to murder him; but the Ishmaelites, accidentally passing by, they sold Joseph to them, and they carried him into Egypt and sold him to Potiphar. Potiphar's wife tempts him to uncleanness, and being denied by Joseph, she accuses him to his lord, who casts him into the king's prison. Whilst he was there, the king's butler and baker were cast into the same prison, and dreamed their several dreams, which Joseph expounded to them, and the event verified his interpretation. The butler, who was restored to his office, forgot Joseph, till two years after, when Pharaoh dreamed a dream which none of the wise men could interpret; and then Joseph was sent for, and advanced to the highest place of dignity and power next to Pharaoh. The years of famine brought Joseph's brethren into Egypt to buy corn, where they bowed before him, according to his dream. This occasioned the removal of Jacob and his whole family into Egypt, where Joseph placed them in the land of Goshen, by which means God fulfilled what he had told Abraham: "Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years." Gen xv. 13. How casual does all this appear to us! But no man will think that prophecies are fulfilled by chance; and therefore we must confess, that what seems chance to us, was appointed by God.

[*To be continued.*]

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'Corkle,—*a Layman.*

(*Continued.*)

I WILL now return to the proposed prophecy. [See Daniel vii.] "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit." This vision, with many others too terrible for endurance, is handed over to the close of time, a time the most remote. But the same difficulties which present themselves in the other alarming predictions are manifest in this. It foretells an overthrow of governments, at least of imperial; and to connect the passage with Cor. xv. 24. there seems but little room to expect that any are to survive the general wreck. What room for civil authority when Christ is to reign universally? He is to put down all rule and all authority. "The judgment was set and the books were opened." This passage

looks as if the final day was its object. It may have an allusion to the close of time, but this cannot be the meaning of the passage.—This is admitted, by the most learned divines. It is much easier to reconcile the prediction to the judgment of the great *whore*, the fall of anti-christ, than to reconcile the latter part of the vision, to the final judgment.

If great names have weight, a Newton may be cited among those who believed in the personal appearance of Christ, and that the judgment would continue a thousand years. Peter too, may with much propriety, be quoted in support of the opinion; when he says, that "one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

"I beheld then, (at the very time of this judgment,) because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame." Now if this *horn*, this *beast*, be a figure of the anti-christian, imperial authority, which rose in the church, and I challenge a different construction, then must this horn, this anti-christ, this son of perdition, reign till the final close of time; if the final judgment, be the meaning of the vision. For the downfall, the entire destruction of this *horn*, this *beast*, and the judgment alluded to, are evidently to be at the same time. "As concerning the rest of the beasts, (the first empires which rose,) they had their dominion taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time." What! lives prolonged, for a "season and time," after the close of time! And the latter part of the vision is still more difficult to reconcile to the final day; for the universal reign of Christ is manifestly alluded to; "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Is there to be people, nations, and languages after the final judgment! And farther, every prediction relative to the kingdom of Christ, is to have an accomplishment on earth; for at the close of all things, the kingdom is to be given into the hands of the father—so says Paul. "I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them; until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High," &c. "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end."

Now, to the sitting of this very judgment, is this very horn, or the anti-christ, to make war on the saints, and to "overcome them, according to John; let the judgment, sit when it may, and is to "wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." This is the precise time that anti-christ is to reign. See Rev. 12. 14. "for a time, and times, and half a time." Also, the forty and two months, the twelve hundred and sixty days—all corresponding, respecting the length of time that this horn, the beast that rose out of the sea. The son of perdition, should reign, and "wear out the saints of the Most High. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end."

From the tenor and bearing of this vision, taken as a whole, the judgment spoken of, and the destruction of the horn, or the persecuting authority, are to be contemporaneous events, and cannot be separated. If the horn be a figure of anti-christ, (and to nothing else can it be applied) then is this judgment to sit previous to his final destruction. If the vision be relative to the final judgment, according to the commonly received opinion, it will involve in difficulties, which can never be solved: for, during the reign of Christ, the sword is to be beaten into a plough-share, and the spear into a pruning hook; and men learn war no more. This precludes the very existence of any authority or power, making war with the saints and overcoming them.

During the reign of Christ, the saints are to possess the kingdom; the twelve hundred and sixty years preceding this judgment, is to be marked with persecutions, famous for martyrdoms, and the blood of saints.

How illy prepared is the world for such events as these, they are to come as a thief in the night. How wide is this judgment to extend its inexorable jurisdiction? Who may set a limit? Who stand the shock, when the eternal God ariseth to "shake terribly the earth?"

Now reader, just as sure as there is truth in the prophecy of Daniel, this vision in its magnitude, its "fiery stream, its burning flame, its judgment and its relative events, are all to have an accomplishment, previous to the introduction of the Millennium, or Christ's universal reign: and there is a strong probability, that the present generation is not to pass away until all these things be fulfilled.

With this prophecy of Daniel, couple Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians, first and second chapters. The very same event is pointed at, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God."

The general conflagration of the material world, with the heavens, &c. is a hackneyed subject, and forms a part of almost all those things call sermons. Among the first impressions which we receive, is something about the dissolution of nature, the world on fire, "melted rocks and mountains," "the war of elements," &c. These things have made a false impression on the mind, forming a part of our religion, held sacred; almost as dear as immortality—and to question these things almost amounts to heresy. Thus every passage we find in the Bible, threatening fire or alarm, is turned over to the final judgment. If we trace these blunders back to this source, we will find them originating where most of our blunders do, among the priests.

Upon a close and impartial examination of the Bible, I have settled down in the belief, that the doctrine of universal conflagration of the material world, is not tenable from philosophy or scripture—my motive is not to shew, that the doctrine of *world burning*, is untrue; but to shew the misapplication of those metaphors by our teachers,—that they have mistaken all the metaphors in the Bible, (and most of its commands and precepts too—) would to the Lord, I could induce men to depend on themselves and their God! No doctrine can be true,

when fairly at opposites with the laws of nature—and, if those passages in the Bible, on which the doctrine of *world burning* is predicated, be metaphors, the whole theory will go overboard at once.

No doubt but we are to have a deluge of fire, probably from some foreign source, perhaps a comet; but it is to have a very different commission to perform, than the destruction of our globe.

Upon the constituted laws of nature, the world can never be destroyed by fire—it cannot be supported upon philosophical principles—it is impossible that the most intense action of fire for ages, could make the world a pound less ponderous than it is. The common elements are not combustible. You cannot set the air on fire, earth cannot burn—every body knows the power of water over fire—more than three-fourths of our globe is water—not one particle can be annihilated—not a particle made—fire cannot destroy it—it may be changed into steam, but it instantly returns to water, when the action of heat is suspended. On what principles are the heavens to be set on fire? Is there combustible matter in open space? Fire has only a relative existence. First, while it is supplied with suitable materials, could the world on fire affect the planets, or all the planets on fire communicate fire to the earth? Impossible. It is probable, that fire would no more exist beyond the atmosphere, than it would in the ocean. It is absurd and ridiculous, to think that the heavens above, can undergo a conflagration; and equally so, to believe the earth can, from any thing arising out of its component parts, or its relative connexion with the stary heavens. If, then, our earth be destroyed, it will not rise out of any constituted laws in nature. I admit he who created can destroy; but who can give a reason why this beautiful world is to be destroyed,—because its occupants are sinners!

The only passages, which can fairly be applied, to the final judgment, or the close of time, has not the most distant allusion, to a destruction of the material world; and those which threaten fire, have considerations coupled with them, which render their application to the final day, very doubtful.

Sacred writ tells us, the world was destroyed by a flood. Now, the material world was not destroyed, but the people: so will it be, in the destruction threatened by fire, The term *world*, in the Bible, is often applied to dispensations. The meaning of many places, is entirely mistaken, if the term be considered as relative to the material earth. In the parable of the tares, the meaning is entirely lost, if the passage, "So shall it be in the end of this world," be not considered, relative to the dispensation. The principal scripture upon which the doctrine of *world burning*, is predicated, is found in Peter's second Epistle, third chapter. To take the whole chapter together, and by a proper regard to relative scripture, a very different construction may be put upon it, and the passage applied to entirely a different object. Peter has an allusion, to a *heaven* and *earth*, which were of old. "Whereby the world, that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of

ungodly men." This evidently has a reference to a *heaven* and *earth* which are not, which are past, or there is inconsistency in the writer; and this very construction is couched in the passage taken together. Now if we can find out what kind of heaven and earth were destroyed by water, we can know what kind is involved in the destruction by fire.

To be consistent, the terms *heaven* and *earth* must be considered metaphors, (the church and the people of the world;) and, taken thus, there is no inconsistency in the case. "Reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Is this a different judgment from that which Daniel saw—a different fire from the "fiery stream which issued and came forth from before him"? Is it a different heaven from that which "departed as a scroll"? I have before shown that these predictions do not relate to the close of time—"in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise." I have also shown that the word *heaven* in most of the prophecies does relate to the church. Now will the fall of Antichrist, the most corrupt, tyrannical, bloody, ungodly church that ever existed, be blotted out of existence without noise? Will the crush of thrones, the removing of the present generation with all its appendages —the pompous retinue of ten thousand times ten thousand attendants—the blaze of glory which is to accompany the descent of the King of kings, take place without "a great noise"? A great sound of a trumpet will proclaim the approach of him who is to rule the nations with a rod of iron. "The elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up." Now is not the body of Antichrist composed of elements—his body is to be destroyed and "given to the burning flame"? And farther, there is no doctrine of much importance found in the sacred oracles, but is supported by two or three witnesses; and this doctrine of burning the *earth*, if Peter's prediction is to have a literal fulfilment, has no other backing, plainly and pointedly to the purpose, in all the holy book; and to make the matter worse, it is at opposites with the very laws of nature—and more, this given principle which is to destroy the world, can never perform that which is allotted to its office, with the combustible matter a thousand such worlds as this would afford.

Let me not be misunderstood in these matters. The doctrine of *world-burning*, abstractly considered, is not worth a serious argument. But as it has drawn, and is drawing into its channel, and swallowing up all the alarming predictions within the lids of the Bible, thereby producing a misunderstanding of the sacred oracles, it is high time it were assailed; for it is fraught with much danger, and will end in the most fatal consequences, for the reasons above stated.

I will here offer to the thinking, intelligent reader, another reason connected with this subject. Are stars, worlds, suns, those lamps of Omnipotence, illuminating his "many mansions," to be blotted out or destroyed for the purpose of congregating a boundless universe to worship an Omnipresent God? Where is heaven? Where is God? Heaven is as boundless as creation; yet *heaven* often, in the sacred pages, just means God's moral government on earth.

I am not invalidating the law or the testimony, but trying to show that Peter is unquestionably speaking in metaphorical language; and his heaven, which is to be destroyed by fire, is none other than the heaven which is to be rolled together as a scroll; and his "earth and the works that are therein," is none other than such a world as was destroyed by water—*to wit*, the inhabitants of the world at large, in contradistinction from the church. Just such a destruction by *fire* is awaiting the *world* as it once suffered by water; and it will be repeopled again during the Millennium. Let any one who may choose make the calculation, and the doctrine of the Millennium, with the present number of inhabitants, will probably destroy itself; say it is to last only a thousand years, with the present population increasing at the common rate, without war, natural or moral evil—"Let him that hath understanding count the number."

I would ask if there are no elements composing the body of Antichrist, on which this fire can act with effect, "his body (is to be) destroyed and given to the burning flame." "Nevertheless, we, according to his promise, look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." This furnishes a reason; aye, it fairly gives the cause, why the "heavens and earth which are now" are to be destroyed. A charge of unrighteousness is fairly implied. Can this relate to the heavens above or the earth beneath—the material world?

Unrighteousness brought a flood upon the world, a scourge upon the Jewish church, and will soon pull down the fire of Omnipotence on the "heaven and earth which are now." But the material earth will remain inconscious, unhurt, while its puny and wicked inhabitants are taught the meaning of these alarming metaphors in the terrible events.

Now, if we will go into the *heavens* from whence the Star fell, the heaven wherein the woman appeared clothed with the sun, the heaven which is to be rolled together as a scroll, where the personage is to appear on a white horse, with a sharp sword, treading "the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God:" I say, if we go into the heaven, or moral administration, where these things have been, or are to be transacted, (for they cannot be transacted in the worlds above,) we will find objects upon which the whole may have an accomplishment, and perfectly coincide with Scripture, with relative predictions, with reason, and with the former dealing of God toward corrupt dispensations.

Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians, 1st and 2d chapters, are among the most prominent predictions in the New Testament relative to the rise and fall of the son of perdition. They should be read in close connexion; also, in connexion with the preceding epistle, wherein the Apostle gave them to know that the day of the Lord so "cometh as a thief in the night," and at a time when men would be preaching peace and safety, then destruction should be at the very door.

Paul, in his former epistle, had caused some uneasiness about the day which was coming on the world as a thief. "To you who are

troubled," says he, "rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him," &c. "that ye be not soon shaken in mind," &c. "as that day of Christ is at hand," &c. "for that day shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed," &c. "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."

These passages present some very important considerations. First, a falling away; second, the rise of the man of sin. These are evidently antecedent to the following items of the highest importance. First, Christ being revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance," &c. Second, "our gathering together unto him"—[no Lo, here! or Lo, there! in that day.] Third, the destruction of Antichrist, "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." These latter items are evidently to be contemporaneous in their accomplishment, and are to come as a thief in the night, when the world is least prepared and most corrupt. These items correspond with the other prophecies. The Apostles and Prophets strengthen each other's hands, confirming each other's evidence by corroborating testimony. Their testimony seems all to have the same great concentrating point—the return of the Master to his home, the fierce indignation which is to attend the event, and the setting up of his universal reign. This seems to be the tenor of all the prophecies we have examined—their evident bearing. The subject relative to the return of the Master we propose taking up hereafter.

(*To be continued.*)

Epaphras---No. 8.

Dear Sir,

WHATEVER propriety yourself and others may see in prefixing the epithet *original* or *ancient* to the term *gospel*, I am not yet convinced of its necessity or utility. All that I could admit, is, that it may, in some instances, be *expedient.* But I fear that, with all your definitions and explanations, the phrase will denote a theory or an institution—perhaps, "baptism for remission," or some other leading view of faith, reformation, or "the gift of the Spirit." "*Another* gospel" than that announced on Pentecost, there cannot be. A *modern* gospel is no gospel; and as I always give my vote for the Apostles, I say, Let us have *the gospel* without adjunct or epithet other than the apostolic. It is called "the gospel of God," "the gospel of the grace of God," "the gospel of salvation," and "the gospel of Jesus Christ." These are sufficient for me and for all who read with veneration the Apostle's word. If, indeed, you write or speak of the things called

"gospel" now-a-days, and admit them to be gospels at all, then you may speak of the ancient, the original, the apostolic gospel; or if you call them *counterfeits*, then you may call it the *genuine* gospel, &c. But with me there is now but one gospel, as there is but one faith and but one immersion. However, as I before said, for the sake of contradistinction it may be tolerated to use the epithets *ancient* and *modern* before "gospel;" but this ought to be of necessity, and not of choice.

Your history of the phrase "*restoration* of the ancient gospel," and the incidents of 1827, are so far satisfactory as respects the practice of those principles, and the use of the "phrase, "For the remission of your sins I immerse you," &c. But, sir, this with me stands on the same footing as the epithet *ancient*. Expediency and circumstances may justify the pronunciation of these words for a testimony to others: but I am fastidious (you will say) in keeping to the text. If any addition is made to any institution, in word or action, for the sake of testimony or explanation, who shall say how far this is to be carried? Who will fix the "hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther"? I certainly believe that the gospel, as explained on Pentecost, led all the baptized to expect remission on their burial with Christ in the institution; but I do not think that Peter or the other Apostles did then, or at any other time, say, in the actual immersion of the candidates (as we moderns call them,) 'For this, or any other special purpose, I immerse you.' It was no doubt so understood by the parties; but there was no specification of this or any other object in the administration of the ordinance. I admit, however, that when any ordinance is in a great measure lost, or so metamorphosed by tradition and human appendages, as to have lost its primitive signification, it ought to be set before the people in as clear and impressive a manner as possible; and, therefore, for the present distress, such explanations may be allowed; but let them be understood to be mere explanations, depending on the understanding of him who adopts them; and let none presume to judge them who may hesitate on their expediency.

We are all apt to lay more stress on some truths, facts, and opinions than on others, according to the bearing they may have upon ourselves, when there is not, abstract from our own feelings, perhaps, any greater comparative importance in the one than in the other. Hence with one, faith; with another, repentance; with a third, immersion, with a fourth, the operation or inhabitation of the Spirit, is reckoned the most fundamental doctrine or truth. In the history of this reformation I have observed something of this sort. I have found some emphasising upon one institution, one point of order, one doctrine, as more cardinal than any other. To me for a time this was also as natural as to any one else. I have always thought that the most cardinal and important position elicited and proved in the last ten years, is that found in the first paper which appears in the first number of the Christian Baptist. The article in which it is found is headed, "*The Christian Religion;*" and the position I find in capitals on page 14—"THE ONLY BOND OF UNION AMONG CHRISTIANS [the pri-

mitive] WAS FAITH IN THE MESSIAH AND SUBMISSION TO HIS WILL." The development of this "ONLY BOND OF UNION" appeared to me then, and for years afterwards, the most important position discussed and settled in this long controversy. But perhaps this was because I had stumbled on that idea myself before it appeared from your pen. I have, from my own experience, been led to suspect that the relation in which we stand to certain truths, and opinions, and practices, gives them very bright charms in our estimation, and makes them appear to us cardinal; whereas, were it not for this, perchance they would stand like privates in the great army of truths, facts, or opinions.

This hint has been of use to myself, and I would hope that it might be of some use to others. There is no doubt a relative importance in truths, and this may allowably influence our esteem and veneration for them; but care should be taken that this esteem be for the truth's sake, and not for our relation to it—as its discoverer or propagator. Such attachments are fleshly and savor of the flesh.

Touching the gift of the Holy Spirit, as added to the phrase, "For the remission of sins," &c. I am pleased to find you do not defend it. To me it appears quite apochryphal; and very certain do I feel that the Apostles never put a man into the water for the purpose of receiving the gift specified in Acts ii.38. If they did, then were all the believers in Samaria, and among the Gentiles in Cesarea, deceived in their immersion. But as you have something more to say on the import of this promise, I shall close for the present.

Yours as ever in the Lord,

EPAPHRAS.

[Reply to Epaphras in our next.]

New Year's Evening at Mr. Goodal's.

CONVERSATION AFTER DINNER.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 170.]

Mrs. Fowler.—CAN brother Reed inform us in what way angels could contend with one another?

Mr. Reed.—This question arises from the words of Gabriel to Daniel, concerning his fighting with the Prince of Persia, who, it appears, was the presiding angel of Persia. But should we fail in forming a definite idea of the mode of such warfare, still it is to be acquiesced in, provided it is a clearly established fact that angels can fight or contend with each other.

Mrs. Fowler.—This will be conceded. But does it not appear to you, brother Reed, somewhat too bold to found such a doctrine on the symbolic book of Daniel?

Mr. Reed.—I do not found this doctrine on the book of Daniel, though I cannot well explain the passages quoted from Daniel on any rules of interpretation, otherwise than as intimating the presidency of angels over the affairs of mortals; and this very presidency over human affairs implies that there are two classes of such angels, the good and the evil; and if they have not power to contend with each other, I cannot understand how they can preside advan-

tageously over our affairs. But I have other testimony than the passages quoted from Daniel. Have you forgotten that Michael and Satan had a battle in the land of Moab about the body of Moses?

Mrs. Fowler.—I frankly acknowledge I did not think of this. But pray what did they dispute about?

Mr. Reed.—"About the body of Moses" Jude informs us.

Mrs. Fowler.—And what did Satan want with the body of Moses?

Mr. Reed.—This, sister Reed, is another question. The one before us is rather, Did Michael and Satan contend?

Mrs. Fowler.—They did; and therefore I admit that Michael, or any other Prince, (Gabriel if you please,) might contend with Satan or any other potentate in his kingdom—the Prince of Persia, the Prince of Grecia, or of any other country.

Mr. Williamson.—Really, Mr. Reed, my curiosity is up on the subject of Satan and Michael's contest in the valley of Moab. If this matter could be explained, it might throw light upon some other passage, or upon the whole subject of the ministry of angels.

Mr. Reed.—I will put it to the present company; or, if you please, to Father Goodal himself, whether such a question be edifying; and if decided in the affirmative, then may I not take the opinion of all present upon the merits or meaning of the dispute between Michael and Satan?

Father Goodal.—Brother Reed, I do not think that such questions tend to godly edifying, unless so far as they may illuminate our minds on the whole subject of revelation; and as we have got up this curious and interesting subject it may be expedient to go through with it.

Mr. Reed.—Well, Father Goodal, have you ever thought upon the cause of the controversy in that valley in the land of Moab?

Father Goodal.—I have generally acquiesced in the views of an old acquaintance, who has long since gone to rest. He was a layman, it is true; but he was the most skilful layman in the word of righteousness I ever knew. His persuasions were, that Satan having succeeded in gaining a strong establishment in every country by the deification of dead men, he wished to have a similar institution in Judea, and thought that if he could begin with Moses, and have a monument erected over his body, in process of time the nation would worship in the temple of Moses; and thus the true God would have a temple in no nation under heaven.

Michael, then, according to your views, the presiding angel of Judea, was deeply interested in this matter, and at least as potent in policy and power as Satan himself, anticipated the enemy, and secreted the body where Satan himself could not find it. How long they contended is not told us; but though the controversy was extremely hot and fierce on both sides, Michael never waxed so wroth as to forget himself, and therefore reviled not his adversary; but in the name of Jehovah routed him with, "*The Lord rebuke thee, Satan.*"

The battle being won, the body was interred, by order of the Lord, in a spot at the foot of the mountain in this valley of Moab; which Satan, and, as a consequence, no man knows even to this day. Thus through the presidency of Michael over the affairs of Judea, Moses was never deified.

Mr. Reed.—And if I may be allowed to add a word, by the same, or another Prince, Satan was defeated when he contended for the deification of Jesus by the evil angel who presided over Roman affairs, when the Roman Senate were debating about the *apotheosis* or deification of Jesus Christ. This is the only plausible and rational exposition of one of the most marvellous things in the history of the deification of heroes and great men, viz.—that Moses and Jesus, the most illustrious in universal history, should be the only two of all the race of national founders and saviours, that were not deified in the countries and by the people amongst whom they lived and died.

Mrs. Fowler.—I feel amply rewarded for my persisting in my demands on the good nature of brother Reed; and were it not that I have engrossed so

much of the time with my questions about the ranks of angels, I would propose another question.

Mr. Reed.—Say on.

Mrs. Fowler.—Of what nature are the contests of angels? Are they mere arguments, or do they use violence or force?

Mr. Reed.—Arguments and reproofs are, it appears, their chief weapons with one another; but how far and in what manner they may use their strength, analogous to ours, is among the incomprehensibles to us dwelling in the outer court of this magnificent creation.

Father Goodal.—It is of more consequence for us to understand, if we can, their modes of assault upon us, than upon one another; and therefore I would urge attention to brother Reed while he illustrates his fourth point—*the ministry of angels;* for I think in discussing this topic he will throw much light upon all the others.

Mr. Reed.—I feel the necessity of sustaining my remarks on the nature, number, and ranks of angels, by the developement of the ministry or works of angels, as far as goes the Bible on this subject.

Mrs. Fowler.—I will reserve my other difficulties until I have heard brother Reed on this most interesting subject.

Mr. Reed.—To understand this subject; as far as revealed let us pursue the synthetic mode of reasoning; let us, by a particular examination of the various works and words ascribed to angels, collect into one view all that is ascribed to angels in the sacred scriptures, and see what they have done. But can any one suggest the best method of doing this?

Father Goodal.—Let brother Reed pursue his favorite course. Let him divide the sacred history into so many ages, and then inquire what angels have done in each of these ages.

Mr. Reed.—Well, be it so. The book of Genesis alone extends over the map of time more than one-third its whole flight. Moses, in fifty chapters, gives us the history of almost 2500 years.

During the patriarchal age, or from the creation to the descent into Egypt, angels are said to have performed the following services:—One called "the or an angel of the Lord," appeared to Hagar (Gen. xvi. 7.) and spoke to her." "An angel of the Lord spoke out of heaven to Abraham." (Gen. xxii. 11.) Two angels visited Lot in Sodom, eat with him, conversed with him, tarried all night with him, smote some of the Sodomites with blindness, gave Lot directions as to his course, took him by the hand, and led him, his wife, and his daughters out of the city. (Gen. xix. 1.) An angel of the Lord accompanied Eleazar of Damascus on his journey to Mesopotamia to the city of Nahor, and assisted him in finding a wife for Isaac. (Gen. xxiv. 7, 40.) The angels of God met Jacob on his way to meet his brother Esau, and assisted him on his journey from the country of Laban. (Gen. xxxii. i.) Jacob, in blessing Joseph, speaks of the angel of the Lord who had redeemed him from all evil. (Genesis xlviii. 16.)

Mr. Williamson.—Some of these angels, I have understood from the American Divines, have been understood as God himself. Thus "the angel of the Lord," (Gen. xvi. 7.) which appeared to Hagar, is understood by some of them to be the Lord himself; because, in the 10th verse of the same chapter, he says, "*I* will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude." The question with them is, With what propriety could an angel of the Lord say this, if he was not the Lord himself? Again, this angel predicts the future destiny, and promises the future fortunes of Hagar's son; and she herself avows her conviction that it is the Lord himself who addresses her; for she exclaims, "Thou God seest me," or "She called the name of the Lord that spoke with her, *Thou God seest me.*"

Mrs. Reed.—I have also pondered much upon the angel of the Lord that spoke to Abraham. (Gen. xxii. 11.) This person, called *the angel of the Lord*, says to Abraham, (verse 12,) "Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing to him; for now I know that thou fearest God, *seeing thou hast not*

withheld thy son, thy only son, from me." Again, the 15th verse intimates that the angel of the Lord called a second time out of heaven, and said, "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord: for because thou hast done this thing——in blessing I will bless thee," &c. "And in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed—*besause thou hast obeyed my voice.*"

Mrs. Fowler.—That we may throw all our difficulties into one pile, let me add *the man* with whom Jacob wrestled till the breaking of the day, and who blessed Jacob when he asked his name; Jacob understood to be not merely an angel of the Lord, nor a man, but God himself; for he called the place *Penuel*, which signifies *the face of God:* for, adds he, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved."

Mr. Reed.—If some of the passages quoted do not refer to the angels of God, properly so called, certainly they ought not to be relied on in ascertaining the services of angels. I do admit that there is some plausibility in that theory which represents the angel of the Lord, or *maleak Yehovah*, as the same person called in the Septuagint *Megales Boules Angelus*, (the Angel of the Great Counsel.) Isaiah ix. 6. But even that view of "the angel of Jehovah" precludes the idea that it is God himself: for the angel, or the messenger of the King, is not the King himself. This phrase is by many supposed to be the word of God which was made flesh; and it is not to be doubted that "the angel of the Lord" in these passages represents or personates the Lord himself. He speaks in the name of Jehovah.

That an angel of the Lord, personating the Lord himself, is the more natural view of these passages, I infer from two considerations:—First, because in other places, where there can be no doubt that an angel is intended, the angel speaks in a style above himself. Thus spoke Gabriel to Daniel, and to Zechariah the father of John. And in the second place, the angel who spoke out of heaven to Abraham, and who promised to do such great things for Abraham, in his exordium shows that he speaks for, or in the name of, Jehovah. v. 16. chap. xxii. The passage reads, "The angel of the Lord called out of heaven to Abraham, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord; for because thou hast done this thing," &c. The phrase "*saith the Lord,*" implies that the angel speaks in the name of Jehovah, and that the angel of Jehovah is not Jehovah himself.

Mrs. Fowler.—But I own it seriously affects not the argument whether we understand *the angel of the Lord*, mentioned Gen. xvi. 7. xxii. 11. and some other places, to represent some extraordinary messenger of Jehovah, or one of his ordinary messengers sent to represent his government and will; provided brother Reed can show from other passages that similar sayings and doings are ascribed to the ordinary angels of God.

Mother Goodal.—But there is another passage in the book of Genesis on this subject, which brother Reed has not mentioned; perhaps he intends it. On it I would ask a question.

Mr. Reed.—I have not intentionally omitted any passage which speaks of angels in that book; indeed I have quoted one passage in which the name is not found. Jacob wrestled, it is said, with a *man*, and not with an *angel*. But as this is generally taken to mean not a man literally, but an angel, I have without debate so applied it.

Mother Goodal.—The passage to which I allude is found in Gen. xviii. 2.—"Lo three *men* approached Abraham's door;" and these three men are addressed as the Lord. It is said, "The Lord appeared to him in the plains of Mamre," &c. and this appearance of the Lord is described as the visit of three men, who were refreshed by Abraham under the tree. Now my question is, Was one of these three the Lord, and the other two his attendants?

Mr. Reed.—It would seem that but two of the three went on to Sodom after eating and being refreshed under the tree of Abraham; and that one of the three, called *the word of the Lord*, (Gen. xv. 1.) and here *the Lord*, continued with Abraham, and described to him his purposes concerning Sodom.

The *two* men or angels that went to Sodom, appear to be of the *three* who called upon Abraham; and while they are spoken of as angels, they appear to the Sodomites as men. They eat with Lot as they had done with Abraham.

Thomas Goodal.—Can angels eat the food of men?

Mr. Reed.—When they assume the form of men, they can assume all the actions of men.

Mrs. Fowler.—You say, brother Reed, that one of the three was called *the word of God*, (Gen. xv. 1.) and here *the Lord*. How do you prove this?

Mr. Reed.—The first time that DEBAR, *Yehovah*, corresponding to LOGOS, *Theou*, 'the word of God,' (John i. 1.) occurs in the Bible as representing a revelation from God, is found in Genesis xv. 1. and here it seems to be some messenger or person in a vision, saying to Abraham, "*I am thy shield and thy great reward.*" This word, or messenger of the Lord, Abraham addresses as his Lord in the next verse. The same person is represented as appearing to him in the plains of Mamre, and is called the Lord; but on a second look it appeared as if *three men* were approaching him. But this is going too far from our subject, and is rather speculating than reasoning on the import of words. In the mean time will sister Maria gather up the fragments gathered from the book of Genesis on the ministry of angels.

Maria Goodal.—Waving the doubtful and disputable passages, the following appear to be incontrovertible:—They have assumed the form of men, did speak in our language, and can do all the acts and deeds which men can perform. In the form of men, they have guided by their counsel and led by their power, the people of God in the midst of great trials and difficulties. On special errands they gave original revelations, and predicted future events to the illustrious fathers of our race. In the book of Genesis alone they appear to have performed all the services which man could require in reference to all the circumstances in which he lives.

Mr. Williamson.—So far is clear. But does not Jacob allude to one angel, called his redeeming or guardian angel, who redeemed him from all evil; and may it not have been from this that the idea of a guardian angel is assigned to every individual?

EDITOR.

Everlasting Gospel---No. 3.

NO kingdom of this world has yet become a kingdom of Jesus Christ. The constitution, laws, and customs of each and every kingdom of this world contemplates a state of society wholly unlike that which the constitution, laws, manners, and customs of the Christian religion would mould and fashion. The first aim of all communities is to get up an efficient system of defence against the infractions of other societies, and to defend the individual members of it from the inroads and frauds of their fellow-citizens. In the formation of every kingdom of this world, it is presumed that the laws of Jesus Christ are wholly inadequate to its preservation and government. Hence the parade of armies, navies, arsenals, munitions of war, swords, spears, prisons, gibbets, with all the paraphernalia of courts, judges, fines, and penalties. Could we imagine a kingdom under the entire control of Jesus Christ, governed solely by his maxims, we would be astonished at the contrast. We should find the citizens without not only taxes, but without all and every thing for which taxes are levied. The toils and burthens of society would be so diminished, were the whole of any society under the exclusive sovereignty of Jesus Christ,

that none of us can imagine how easy it would be to obtain all that is necessary to the comfortable enjoyment of life. Could we subtract from our present expenditures of labor, and toil, and care, all that rebellion against the Lord's Anointed now costs these United States, doubtless we would be astonished to find that scarce a tithe remained. The whole machinery of our state and federal government would be a public nuisance were the citizens all under Christ, and neighboring kingdoms reconciled to his supremacy over all. The hordes that now live upon the vices of men, from him who manufactures the lock and key up to him who commands the army and the navy, with all the thousands of leeches that fatten upon our individual and national sins, would be engaged in some more honorable employments, and society relieved of not only all these taxes direct, but of a thousand others directly accruing from the present systems and acts of rebellion against the rightful sovereignty of Jesus, constituted Lord of all.

Wars are the curses of nations: foreign or domestic wars have always been ruinous to those long exercised in them. But our fightings with neighboring states and nations, grievous as they are, occasionally cease; and the piping times of peace afford a breathing interval, in which we recruit our national finances: but in this long war, in this untiring rebellion against heaven's rightful sovereign, there has not been a moment's respite now for two thousand years, and this has made bankrupt our happiness and involved us in ten thousand evils which no politician has ever yet thought of. The annual expences of this our national war against Messiah are greater than the annual revenues of the richest kingdom under heaven. The friends of the Great King are so few in comparison of the many in power, that they can only remonstrate against this rebellion, and plead for the rights of the Redeemer to reign over those whom he ransomed at so high a price. But the majority will not hear us, and are determined to make us pay the expences if we will not take up arms in the cause. Thus they who would shout hosannas to the rightful sovereign, and whose joy would be complete if he were the only King, are groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for the adoption or redemption promised at the coming of the Lord.

When, then, an angel is heard announcing the everlasting good news that the hour of judgment is come, all Christian ears are attentive, and every Christian heart dilates with joy, anticipating what is to follow the dethronement of all the rivals of our Lord Messiah. He shall put down all rule, all authority, and all power opposed to the benign spirit and tendency of his reign.

The nature of this judgment is the first thing that claims our attention. It must be observed that various days of judgment are passed. The destruction of the antediluvians by water—of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire—of Babylon—of Jerusalem by an accumulation of vengeance, are set forth as emblems of the fiercer wrath which is to be poured out upon Babylon the Great—the antichristian hierarchies which oppress the earth.

In her indictment what a recital of treasonable acts—what an enumeration of crimes of the deepest dye! She is charged with deceiving all nations with her sorceries, and with having shed the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth. She enticed all the kings of the earth into fornication; for uncleanness she surpasses Sodom; for tyranny and oppression she transcends Egypt and her Pharaohs; for horrid and relentless cruelty she outrivals Jerusalem in the last days of her delinquency. On each of these items she is to be judged. We shall scan the outlines of these accusations, that we may understand the nature of this judgment.

"*Her sorceries.*"—Sorcery was carried to great perfection in Egypt. There the literal sorcerers practised their arts of deception in the presence of the court and Moses. Those who by drugs, philtres, fumigations, tricks, sleight of hand, pretended to produce supernatural effects by supernatural agency in Egypt and other idolatrous countries, became the types of those spiritual and mystical sorcerers who have deceived the nations by their pretended extraordinary powers—holy orders, images of Christ bleeding, miracles wrought at the tombs of saints, holy relics of the cross, &c. &c. double meanings, apostolic succession, official power, transubstantiation, consubstantiation, holy water, holy places and holy days, &c. &c. By these figments nations have been drawn into the blind adoration of a set of spiritual guides who, having put out their eyes, enslaved them to their interests, and have kept them in bondage until now. The annihilation of spiritual sorcery would be a consummation most devoutly to be wished for. As by it hierarchies were got up, and Christianity for a time put down, as was Moses for a time by the Egyptian clergy, its judgment would be the emancipation of all the world from faith in, and obedience to, any set of men, titled and enthroned as they may be, as the representatives or successors of the apostles of Christ; or to the doctrines and views of privileged orders in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, however specious and imposing they may render their pretensions to the credulous and uninstructed. Welcome the day when sorcerers shall practise their enchantments no more!

EDITOR.

From the "Presbyterian"—Philadelphia, April 10.

"Campbellism.—The name of Alexander Campbell is probably well known to most who will take up this paper. The scene of his labors has been laid chiefly in the western country, and few living errorists have done so much to rend and corrupt the church in that region. We have not had our attention drawn to this subject in an equal degree with our Baptist brethren, and therefore we write with some diffidence, and hold ourselves subject to correction; yet the following particulars are, we think, well ascertained. The ravages which the Campbellites have committed upon the orthodox Baptist churches of the south and south-west, are almost incalculable. Campbell boldly proclaims that immersion is 'the regenerating act.' It appears from his publications, that having been asked whether a person can have evidence that his sins are pardoned before he is immersed, he answered by inquiring *whether a person can be*

lean before he is washed. His system is exceedingly subtile, and his character admirably suited to a work of public delusion.

The following method is commonly pursued, as we have learned from a friend. A shrewd follower of Campbell comes to a certain village where these errors are unknown. He at first calls himself a Baptist, and no one suspects the contrary. He professes great liberality of sentiment towards other denominations, preaches so as to please all, and appears full of zeal. After a little he announces that on such a day he will preach a sermon on Christian Union. At the appointed time he portrays in glaring colors the evils of sectarianism, and traces them all to creeds and confessions. He then proposes a plan in which all can unite, viz.—to lay aside all creeds and take the Scriptures as the only guide. The only question to be asked in order to church membership, is, 'Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ; and are you willing to be governed by his laws alone?' A simple affirmative is the only reply. At the close he commences in a whining tone to call on all who are willing to unite, to come forward. In the instance witnessed by our informant every Baptist who was present went forward. When this had taken place, the preacher began to declare what he called 'the ancient gospel'—simple belief that Jesus is the Christ—and then immersion for the remission of sins.

The Campbellites profess no regard for the Old Testament any further than as it is a history of the new dispensation, or an introduction to it, which could very easily be dispensed with. They deny the obligation of the moral law as contained in the Old Testament, and say that the method of salvation is to be sought only in the Acts of the Apostles; uniformly referring to chapter ii. verse 38. They hesitate not to declare that faith is simple belief that Jesus is Messiah, and that baptism is a saving ordinance."

REMARKS.

This Editor, it seems, writes from public rumor, not from his own reading. Had he lived in Damascus, in the year of Christ 40, and published the rumors of that age against any one of the Apostles, he could have told full as good a tale, and sustained it full as well by one-sided testimony against the very persons whom he now thinks it an honor to quote in favor of his views. But there is a degree of candor (at least apparent candor) in his professed subjection to correction; and therefore, as he has rather solicited information on the subject, and thought our humble efforts to recommend "the Apostle's doctrine" worthy of a passing notice, I would very respectfully inform him that he has done us great injustice in the notice above quoted.

We complain not so much of his style, nor of his array of epithets, such as "errorists," "rending and corrupting churches," "the ravages incalculable," "his system is exceedingly subtile," "his character admirably suited to a work of public delusion:" I say, we complain not so much of this mode of warfare, because any Rabbi, or respectable Gamaliel, could have said all this, and more than this, of either Peter or Paul, or, perhaps, of one still more illustrious than either. But we complain of such assertions as the following:—"The C——s profess no regard for the Old Testament any farther than as it is a history of the new dispensation," &c. "They deny the obligation of the moral law as contained in the Old Testament; and say that the method of salvation is to be sought only in the Acts of the Apostles." These assertions are without foundation, and just as gratuitous as

theirs who said and affirmed that Paul taught, "Let us do evil that good may come." We teach no such doctrines. We can show from numerous passages of our works, written at different intervals, for ten years, that we hold the Old Testament in the highest veneration—most devoutly read it in our families and churches. We contend that every moral precept which the law of Moses contains, is in its nature immutable. And as for "the method of salvation" being all found in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. ii. 38. the *Presbyterian* is the first and the only person I have heard or seen utter such a sentiment. His friend who tells him of "the shrewd follower of Campbell," has betrayed this gentleman into the grossest errors, and for his own reputation's sake he ought to be more cautious in publishing such unfeasible tales, as neither Presbyterian, Baptist, nor Methodist, who knows any thing of the reformation in faith and manners for which we contend, can believe him in other matters, having found him guilty of such palpable blunders (to give them no worse name) in a matter so well understood by all of them who will either read what is written, or hear what is spoken by those who are competent to announce the apostolic institutions.

His references to our views on faith, baptism, and submission to the laws of the Messiah, are only partially correct; and in the attitude in which they are placed before the reader, they must mislead him, if he have no other information than the rumors of "the Presbyterian." It is true that we define the word *faith*, as importing no more than *the belief of testimony;* but as a *principle of action*, it is defined to be confidence in the promises of God: or, according to Paul, "the confidence of things hoped for; the conviction of things not seen."

"Baptism as the regenerating act," must always deceive a Presbyterian; because, though we might use such a phrase, it is not, in their import of the word, regeneration. We would not say that in their import of the word *regeneration*, baptism is the regenerating act; because we agree with them, that a person must be quickened or made alive by the Spirit of God, before he is born. This they call regeneration; but we contend that this is not what is called regeneration by the apostles. There is a begetting, as well as being born, if we may believe Peter, Paul, John, or James, on this subject. Being born of water, and regenerated, were, indeed, Paidobaptists themselves being judges, anciently, convertible terms. "Of his own will, (says James,) he has impregnated or begotten us by the word of truth"—"Born again, (says Peter,) not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which ever lives"—"Except a man be born of water and Spirit, (says Jesus,) he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—and Paul says, "He has saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit." These, and many other testimonies, we do think, sustain us in regarding immersion only as the regenerating act. Our Extra No. 1, on Remission, July 1830, and our Extra Defended, October 1831, are the documents to which we refer all who are desirous to understand these matters, or to do us justice before the public.

We lay much stress, it is true, on Peter's Pentecostian sermon, Acts ii.; not as if the method of salvation "were wholly developed there," or in the Acts of the Apostles; but because the gospel is fully preached, and *the method of enjoying this salvation*, first fully developed there. Peter, to whom the Lord gave the keys of his kingdom, first announced the gospel to the Jews, and to the Gentiles; and as he had the power of remitting and retaining sins, we go to the Acts of the Apostles, to learn how Peter remitted and retained sins. "The word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem," as said the prophets; and to that word we do, indeed, call the attention of all men who wish to know what the Apostles taught. If any one will read the Acts of the Apostles regularly through at one sitting, without note or comment, and repeat it for only a few times,—say one week,—if then he is not convinced that the Apostles' doctrine of conversion and remission differs very essentially from the Presbyterian, and all who have descended from the "Rev. J. Hughes' Holy, Apostolic, and Catholic Church," then I say to that man, Be a Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Catholic, or what you please.

Will "the Presbyterian" be so candid as to permit his readers to see this brief notice of his remarks "on Campbellism"?

EDITOR.

Bishop M'Ilvaine's Opinion of the Reformation.

"*Those called Campbellites, heretics of a peculiarly plausible and antichristian character, have led away a large portion of the western Baptists.*"

SO decides the lately appointed, called and sent Bishop of the whole state of Ohio. This is an extract from a letter from him to the Rev. Dr. Fyng, January 19, 1833, originally appearing in the Episcopal Recorder. There are some other matters set forth by the bishop which call for more than his bare opinion. He quotes too much from a gentleman of no good fame, whom he calls IT IS SAID, and thus wounds his own reputation in other matters. "It is said," says bishop McIlvaine, "that there are *thirty* sects of Baptists in the west;" or, "as many as thirty divisions of Baptists may be counted in the west." He seems to regard the divisions among the Presbyterians and Methodists as quite innocent matters; much to be deplored, but as not involving any essential doctrine of vital godliness—(the more condemnable, then, say I)—but these "plausible heretics of a peculiarly antichristian character," are to be anathematized.

Yes, indeed, the bishop will soon learn, if he have not already, that these *plausible heretics* will give him and his clergy more trouble than the innocent Presbyterians and Methodists with all their opinions. They are such matter of fact people, and will have the testimony of Apostles for whatever they teach, that the bishop will find

them much more plausible than any of his brethren in the opinions and doctrines of men. They are so *peculiarly antichristian*, too, that a word of the Messiah will go farther with them than all the denunciations of all the Bishops from C. P. McIlvaine's diocess to the end of King Harry's realm. EDITOR.

AWFUL DECLENSION IN THE VIRGINIA REGULAR BAPTISTS.

IT has been proposed by the organs of the Regulars, that, in order to admission into the Baptist church, the candidate should have actually first joined a temperance society. Who could have thought, a few years ago, that such a test of fellowship, or such a preliminary condition, could have been proposed to Baptist churches? How imperfect must that system be to reform men, when membership in a temperance society is thought to be an indispensable prerequisite to admission into the church!! What avails the late boasted revivals, if such expedients to preserve sobriety are yet thought of! ED.

LUKE XVI. 18.

BALTIMORE, 13th April, 1833.

Mr. Editor:

PLEASE insert the 18th verse of the sixteenth chapter of Luke, as it reads in the new translation, Thompson, and in the old. —

"Whoever divorces his wife, and takes another, commits adultery; and whoever marries the divorced woman, commits adultery."—*New Translation, 3d & 4th editions.* "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery. And whoever marrieth her who hath been divorced, committeth adultery."—*Thompson.* "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from *her* husband, committeth adultery."—*Common Version.*

The Bishop's Bible (A. D. 1607) reads as does the common. ED.

On Prayer and Special Influence.

(*Reply to Mr. J. W.*)—*Concluded.*

MY DEAR SIR.—

WITH all who tremble at the word of God—with all who regard Jesus as the Light of the world, and his Apostles as the only divinely authorized teachers under him; who by the Holy Spirit utter infallible oracles,—the only question, in deciding all matters of religious belief and practice, must be, *What say the Scriptures?* This, as you very happily expressed the other day, is a question of fact, which is, to the honest and diligent student of the book, of no very difficult solution.

In this book we are commanded to hear the voice of God, to believe it, and to obey it at the hazard of the loss of a blissful immortality. God, in this volume, teaches us that he is the Creator and Preserver, or Saviour, of all men, especially of them that believe. He addresses us according to the relation in which he stands to us, with all dignity and authority, and with all regard to our constitution and circumstances. He approaches us through the medium of our senses, and speaks to our understandings and our hearts in language perfectly adapted to our apprehension. If he address our eye, our ear, or any of our senses, it is for the purpose of communicating ideas, or giving us suitable impressions of his glory, and of our dependence upon him for every thing. He has taught us that "we live, are moved, and do exist in him;" and that without him we have no being. He has taught us in nature, and by his word, that "he gives to all, life, and breath, and all things;" and that he has his own established ways and means of giving us all things. Hence, all his bounties are to be sought in his appointed way.

Grapes are not to be found, nor sought, on thorns, nor figs on thistles:—neither are the means of eternal life to be found in Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, or Seneca, nor in volumes of opinions. If a man would enjoy any blessing, temporal or spiritual, he must seek it in the way in which the Common Benefactor is pleased to bestow it. We must not refuse the honey because it is gathered and concocted by a very humble insect; nor the wool, because the creature which carries it to our door has first worn it till it has become a burthen. We must, then, *read* the word of God for knowledge, *believe* it for faith or confidence, and *obey* it for holiness and righteousness. If we lack any thing, we must pray for it, but not cease to labor for it. If we are not philosophers enough to explain how God can bestow a favor in answer to our prayers, we may be Christians enough to believe that he has said, "Ask, and you shall receive; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you." Whether he sends Gabriel, Uriel, or Raphael; the wind, or the fire—whether he sends an animate, or an inanimate agent; or whether he does it himself, without any agent, is not first to be known, before we ask a favor.

We have been taught to look for the staff of life, and its comforts too, from the earth; and for the bread of life, and the water of life, from the Bible—God, and the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, for our animal life, and health, and riches—God, the Bible, and the kingdom of grace, for our spiritual life, health, and riches:—the means for the end, and the means like the end, in nature and religion. God once fed a nation for forty years with bread from heaven, and made a rock a perennial fountain of water. He has on special occasions sent food and raiment by special messengers. Garments have grown new, and not old, on the backs of Israelites, and a handfull of meal has become a barrel. All this he has done: but ordinarily, he feeds us by our industry and the laws of nature; by the processes of the kingdoms, animal, vegetable, and mineral; by the clouds, the fire, the water, the air, and the earth. So he has sent forth light and sal-

vation. He specially elected and called an Abraham, an Isaac, and a Jacob. He gave his inspiration to a Moses, a Joshua, a Samuel, and a David. He has spoken at sundry times, and in diverse manners, to the fathers and the patriarchs of our race. He now speaks to us by his Son, and invites us, in all times of need, through him, to call upon his name.

I am much pleased, my dear sir, with one of your objections, because it would be my own—because it is my own—to every system which I could suspect of a bearing that way. Need I now state what it is?——"that your views of spiritual influence have a tendency to injure our devotional feelings." This would be with me an insuperable objection to any system of religion. Devotion to God, and communion with him, are the very life and soul of religion. A profession without this, is, to me, a body without a spirit—a dead carcase. The Bible and the Throne of Favor are, in my estimation, inseparable in true devotion. The Bible leads us to God, through Jesus Christ;—the more it is honestly read, the oftener will we be translated to the skies.

But the doctrine of physicial and mystic spiritual influences, I have proved to have the tendency which you and I so much dread. No more prayerless and Christless nominalists in the bounds of my acquaintance, than many who are always looking for special interpositions. The doctrine of fate, of total depravity, and effectual calling, go hand in hand. The one implies the other, and the tendency of all is to alienate the mind from God.

But to harmonize our theories of special providence and special favor, spiritual influence and free agency, &c. are the tasks which philosophers, mental and moral, are for imposing upon us. Yes, my dear sir, the question *how this can be*, is, with the speculators of the world, the vital question: yet not one of the philosophers of mother Nature can explain any one of her processes from first to last, nor explore any one of her creations from beginning to end. They say, however, Break up the fallow ground, and cast the seed into the bosom of the earth, and ask God to rain upon it. They learned this, not from philosophy, but from the husbandman. We say so in the kingdom of grace, because we see the Lord's laborers did so in his field.

Now, my dear sir, your question of fact settles the whole matter. *What has God said to sinner and to saint?* Not, What can we reason, prove, comprehend, demonstrate *a priori?* but, What *has* God said? If he says to the sinner, First pray for the Spirit, wait for the Spirit, I will convert you by the Spirit, effectually call you by the Spirit;—then let us say so too. But if he has not said so, we ought not to say it. What then has he said to the sinner?——Hear, believe, repent, be baptized, separate yourselves, and I will receive you, and be a Father to you, and you shall be my sons and daughters. He has not said, First pray:—nay, he says, "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed"! He says, "Without faith, it is impossible to please God"—"He that comes to God, must believe that he is;" and more than this, "he must believe that God is the rewarder

of them that diligently seek him. No promise to the disobedient in all the book of God, except exclusion from his presence. Scorners are even addressed, and commanded to turn at the reproof of God: "Turn at my reproof, and I will pour out my Spirit upon you. I will make known my words to you." There is a melancholy, mystifying, nullifying, confounding, and Babel-building spirit in the heads of this generation. They put the cart before the horse, and the harrow before the plough. They tell men to pray before they know to whom, and in what manner.

Order is heaven's first law, the Bible's first law, and the Christian preacher's first concern. Nature, reason, and the Bible, say, First *hear*, then believe, then reform; or, to go into the details, First hear, then believe, then repent, then be baptized, calling upon the name of the Lord; pray, ask, seek, knock—add to your faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, love.

We ought not to expect special interpositions, only when appointed means fail, or when we have done our duty; for special interpositions, on every hypothesis, are only designed for such cases as come not under the regular operation of established laws.

I am much pleased, sir, to learn that you intend calling the attention of your hearers to the subject of spiritual influences. No age, nor people, required more setting to rights on this subject, than the present. Only think, sir, of the events of the last half century—Anna Lee, Jemima Wilkinson, and Joe Smith. Only think of Quakerism, Shakerism, the jerkings, barkings, dancings, swoonings; the dreams, visions, and new revelations. Think, my dear sir, of men dreaming, sleeping, waiting for descents of the Holy Spirit, baptism in fire, in order to conversion. Wonder not, then, that such men as Priestly became Socinians; such men as Jefferson, Franklin, and Paine, deists; and that the thinking part of the community have been rapidly verging towards a religion without any Holy Spirit, without any feeling of devotion, without communion with God, and the power of godliness.

I shall be glad to hear from you, on any of these great matters, as often as opportunity will permit. Excuse the informal manner of my reply, and accept the assurance of my high consideration and esteem.

EDITOR.

The Bone of Contention.

JAMESTOWN, O. 9th March, 1833.

Dear brother Campbell,

THE bone of contention in the religious community is about the operation of the Holy Spirit. Each sect ascribes to him a different *modus operandi.* One will have it that he operates physically; another, that he operates morally; one says he operates directly; another, that he operates by means; one, that he operates on the feelings; another, that he operates on the understanding; one says he operates

before faith; another, that he operates through faith; one says the Holy Spirit brings faith; another, that faith brings the Holy Spirit; one says he enters the heart and casts out sin; another, that he enters the heart because sin is cast out, &c. &c.

How is this boiling pot to be calmed? Will it increase till it boils over, and puts the fire out? or will it throw off its contents in vapor, and become empty? or would a dash of cold water into the pot, or the withdrawing of fuel have the effect? Suppose we try by drawing the fuel. Then we would ask the contending parties the following questions:—

Has the Holy Spirit ever operated on any independent of the word, or where the word had not been proclaimed? *Ans.* No.

Has the proclamation of the word, in a language not understood by the hearers, ever effected a reformation? *Ans.* No.

Have not all Christians been made by the proclamation of the gospel? *Ans.* Yes.

These questions being answered as above, then it will appear to all, that the *gospel*, or *word*, is the sword of the Spirit, by which both *sinner* and *saint* are operated upon. In the former it produces *obedience*, and in the latter, *holiness*.

Then let us quit disputing about the *modus operandi*, and be guided by facts. By the gospel sinners have been made saints; and by it saints have been made holy; and without it sinners have not been made saints, or saints made holy. Therefore, *the word of God, heard, understood, and obeyed*, has effected all; and without it, nothing has been done since the apostolic age. M. W.

Progress of Reform.

White Hill, *Williamson Co.* Tenn. February 28, 1833.

I AM truly glad to see that the practice of immersing people and leaving them scattered like sheep without fold or shepherd, has produced some complaining. Without doubt the reformation is suffering greatly on this account. I fear that too many of our proclaimers are (like Paul said of Peter) *to be blamed* upon this subject. The people ought to be taught to count up the cost, and if we cannot prevail on them to observe and do *all* things commanded by Zion's King to be done, we had better quit immersing them; and how they can obey the Son of God *in all things*, without being congregated, is something which is too hard for me. The ancient gospel is becoming quite familiar with most of our "preachers," so far as I have knowledge; but the ancient *order* of *living* the gospel "lies hid in the remote depths of antiquity."

The reformation is progressing as well in this section of the country (I expect) as in any other. There are a few congregations which meet on the first day of the week to worship their Heavenly Father. These are more spiritually minded than those who meet monthly; and what is still more encouraging, I hear some saying they would *go farther* to hear the *oracles of God*, than to hear the greatest preacher on earth. Brother Hopwood and myself (with some little help) immersed something over two hundred last year in our section of the country. I have immersed several this year at Berea, the place of my membership, and the signs in favor of *reform* are much more flattering than at any former period. Your brother in hope,

JOSHUA K. SPEER.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, Ky. March 1, 1833.

THE good cause is still gradually progressing among us. Within a little better than two weeks past, there have been immersed in the waters of Harrod's creek, on the good confession, twenty-two—in part under the labors of our worthy brother Gilbert Herney, late of Franklin Association; and also under the labors of brother John Roberts, who has paid us several visits. Brother Z. Carpenter also has immersed ten or twelve lately in the bounds of Chinoweth Run church; four have been immersed in Louisville lately, and two at La Grange. But I think the practical effects of the ancient gospel are far, very far ahead of the ancient order amongst us. We want more humility, sobriety, gravity, and sincerity—more holiness of life—more established order in discipline and in our worshipping assemblies.

Yours in hope of eternal life,

B. ALLAN.

PATTERSON, N. J. March 1, 1833.

THERE is a man called Mr. *S. C. Jennings*, who writes what he calls a Christian Herald Extra. Where he lives I know not. There is a kind of prospectus at the end of it, stating "The Christian Herald is published by S. D. Baird, at the S. W. corner of Wood and Fourth street," what town, county, state, or kingdom, I cannot tell. One thing I am bold to assert, that it is different from the Christian Herald issued from that meeting held at the day of Pentecost, and must be by a different spirit. I think it might be styled the *spirit of slander*. I found one of those Extra Heralds in the post-office here, directed to me. I have read it all, and cannot find what brought it here. If the writer has any thing to say against you, he had better say it to yourself; for my part, I do not consider myself amenable for your deficiencies, if you have any. I acknowledge no master on earth. I am led by none, implicitly, (in spiritual things,) but by the four gospels and the writings of the apostles.

I differ from him in respect to translations. I have C. Thomson's, P. Doddridge's, Louth's, G. Campbell's, and the New Testament printed by yourself; and from reading them altogether, in connexion with King James, I think I can glean more biblical knowledge than from all the time-serving hirelings of all the *isms* in christendom. These are the Christian Heralds I depend on. And if I knew where the *Extra* came from, I would very willingly direct it home again.

I have been reading your writings now nearly ten years. I have got the ten volumes all bound. I think I have taken heed to the reading of them, for I have often looked at them with a jealous eye; and I believe that in you the cause of gospel reform has found not only a sincere friend but useful vindicator, and one who has been instrumental in recommending and making it known to many. I wish you every success for the gospel's sake.

Yours in hope of immortality,

DAVID REED.

VICTORY, N. Y. March 11, 1833.

I WAS credibly informed yesterday that the Baptist church in Cato and Fra held a meeting on Saturday last to deal with some of their members for *heresy*, as they call it. The crime is, they refuse to bow to human laws, and acknowledge no master but Christ—no constitution but the Scriptures; and they obtained the lean majority of one to consider the brethren under censure.

We had a good day yesterday in celebrating the death and resurrection of our King. Some appearances that the walls of sectarianism begin to tremble.

JOHN M. BARTLETT.

FAYETTE, Howard co. Missouri, March 12, 1833.

Brother Campbell,

I AM entirely unacquainted with you, and but little acquainted with what you have written upon the gospel of Christ; yet I hesitate not to say, from what

I have seen and read of your writings, that they exhibit more light and are better calculated to restore primitive Christianity than any writings I have ever seen.

I was for some two or three years a student of brother Clack, Bloomfield, Ky. from whom I received much good advice. He always advised me to call no man Master on earth, for one was my master in heaven, even Christ.

I was ordained to preach the gospel in November, 1831, and in February, 1832, set out for this place. When I arrived I commenced preaching in this place and vicinity. By those who call themselves orthodox I was called a heretic. They would say to me, "You will become very unpopular." This caused me to search the testimony God had given concerning his Son.

Last September I was a member of the Mount Pleasant Association, where a query came in, written by T. Fristoe, the Moderator of the Association, to know what was to be done with those persons who had embraced the doctrines taught by A Campbell in his Christian Baptist and Millennial Harbinger; which was answered, "Exclude them." This produced strange feelings within me, when I reasoned thus:—Should it be the fact that A. Campbell teaches nothing but what is taught in the word of God, these people have rejected *it;* and if they reject his word, they reject him; and where will they stand in the judgment, having rejected the Christ and his word?

The proceedings of this Association influenced me to see what you did teach, (for before this I would not read your writings.) I obtained the loan of the first and second volumes of your Millennial Harbinger, which I examined, and to my surprise I saw nothing to controvert, unless I opposed the word of God. When I became satisfied that these things were so, I thought it best to leave the Baptist church of which I was a member, in peace and without confusion. So I obtained a letter of dismission; and finding four disciples of the faith of the New Testament, we gave ourselves to one another by the will of the Lord. I commenced proclaiming the gospel in greater simplicity than before, and soon the good effects were seen. I had through the Summer and Fall preached in this place and vicinity, and had not the opportunity of immersing one individual, nor did I see but one immersed through the past Summer and Fall. But the first time we met as a church I immersed two; on the next Lord's day two others came forward and desired to be immersed, which I accordingly did. A short time after I was called from my daily occupation to immerse two more; and at our last meeting three were added to the congregation. My spirit is stirred within me. I shall, if the Lord will, commence riding through the state in a few weeks. We have great opposition here; but the truth will prevail. The Methodist circuit preacher lately immersed six, the most of whom had been sprinkled, and some since grown.

I intend to prepare an address to my Baptist brethren, in which I will give them my reasons for reforming.

You would do me, and likely your readers, a favor by giving us an essay on the duty of deacons, &c.

Yours affectionately,

HENRY THOMAS.

Glasgow, Ky. March 26, 1833.

IN this place there is a congregation of disciples, between sixty and seventy in number, who live in perfect peace, harmony, and union. They have adopted the New Testament for their only guide in all matters of faith and manners—meet every Lord's day for the purpose of refreshing their memories with the incidents of Calvary—for edifying one another, and keeping up all the forms of worship instituted by Jesus and the Apostles.

Your brother in the kingdom and patience of Jesus,

ALEXANDER REYNOLDS.

CALLOWAY COUNTY, Mo. March 22, 1833.

SURROUNDED with opposition by all sectarian societies, and far in the wilds and forests of the West, we, a few names, constituted ourselves on the second Lord's day in December, 1832, into a congregation of the Lord; there being only nine in number, three males and six females. We have since increased to twenty-three in number, and I am of opinion that the prospect is somewhat flattering for gaining many more. Our friends of the Baptists and other denominations have many hard sayings concerning our belief, but utterly refuse investigation. But I have succeeded in getting some of them to read for themselves, and they confess that they can find no such views in your writings as are attributed to you. I received a request a few days ago to visit a Methodist society, 20 miles distant. They had got hold of the Harbinger, and in spite of all their priests can do, are about to blow up. Light is spreading, and men's minds cannot be much longer manacled by sectarianism.

ABSALOM RICE.

NEW YORK, March 30, 1833.

WE now consist of about seventy members. Three from Elder M'Clay's church, about three weeks ago, united with us; namely, brethren Daniel Monroe and his wife, and a young man lately from London. Brother Monroe had been a long time a deacon in Elder M'Clay's church, and was considered one of the pillars of his church. Those persons leaving, has raised a great persecution by slander against them and us, saying all manner of evil against them and us falsely.

Last Sunday, in the midst of some hundreds of spectators, we immersed four persons for the remission of their sins; namely, Dr. Barkers, the Elder's wife, a most amiable disciple, and a young married man, who 6 months before had been a deist, had scouted revelation and blasphemed in his public harangues in their halls, the only Saviour of men, but is now coming to that very cross he despised and humbly confessing his sins to his Saviour, wondering at the mercy which saves such a wretch through that precious blood that was shed on the cross to wash away his sins. A young woman was also baptized, and an elderly woman, between 60 and 70. Both had been members of Presbyterian churches. It was a joyful day for the disciples to see those different descriptions of character entering the visible kingdom through water, with songs of joy and praise to their blessed Redeemer and King.

We then assembled in the afternoon at 3 o'clock, as a church, to give our new brothers and sisters the right hand of fellowship, bidding them, as fellow-disciples of Jesus, a hearty welcome to a participation with us in all the privileges and blessings of the church of Christ on earth preparatory to entering the kingdom of glory above, where there will be fulness of joy and perfect happiness, without any alloy, forever and ever.

BENJ. J. HENDRICKSON.

ELIZABETHTOWN, East Tenn. March 30, 1833.

WE have said but little from this place with regard to the reformation in any public manner. Notwithstanding we are endeavoring to teach and practise the doctrine and commands of the Apostles, as they began to proclaim at Jerusalem. Our congregation at Buffaloe Creek, Carter county, in nine months has increased from about forty to near one hundred members; and I need not add that great efforts have been made to counterbalance our labors. for that seems to be the lot of all in the reformation. But truth is prevailing, and will prevail from the rising of the sun to the place of its going down.

Yours in the hope of eternal life,

JOHN WRIGHT.

GENEVA, April 3, 1833.

THE good cause is gaining ground. Many of our most influential men are submitting to the government of King Jesus. As a proof take the following

from a Methodist preacher, living near Carrolton, Green county, to a friend near Jacksonville:—

"I have never seen such a time for joining the church since my recollection. Some are uniting with the Methodists—some with the Presbyterians; but the great mass of the people, good, bad, and indifferent, are joining the *Campbellites*. Their great Apostle is one Josephus Hewitt," &c.

This is from a most violent opposer; and we could scarcely suspect him of over-rating the success of *Campbellism*, as he calls it.

H. A. CYRUS.

Bruceviele, Ind. April 9, 1833.

ON the 4th of March, 1832, we were constituted a church, with 27 members, the most of us having been previously dismissed from Moriah church. Our platform is the word of God. We have experienced considerable persecution, particularly from our orthodox Baptist brethren, Presbyterians, and Methodists; but hitherto the Lord has helped us. Reform progresses with a steady hand. Brother M. R. Trimble commenced proclaiming the ancient gospel (and I hope in its purity) about Christmas last, and since that time about twenty-five have been immersed on a profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The greater part have been added to our little body. Also, a number of our brethren and sisters from Moriah Creek Church have felt themselves constrained to break off from that church and to unite with us, making our number now upwards of sixty. We have great reason to be thankful for the harmony and love that appear to exist among the brethren; not the least difficulty has presented itself to us as yet. May the good Lord preserve us and keep us in peace, is the prayer of your unworthy brother in the Lord.

WILLIAM BRUCE,

Somerset, Pa. April 9, 1833.

THE kingdom of our heavenly father is moving on through this region, from South to North, and from East to West. Although brother Forward has baptized but forty-four persons since January 30, for want of help, the authority of our King will be made known notwithstanding all the efforts of the prince of darkness. Brother Forward was compelled to go last Lord's day to Westmoreland county to preach to the Seceders and Presbyterians, the place I wrote to you about last Fall. The priest rode all the day before to caution his people against going to hear the heretics or Campbellites, or he would session every one. A friend replied that he would have soon to fall to work, as there had been already 50 or 60 of his members out to hear the word of the Lord, and that he saw nine persons baptized into Jesus Christ. There is no doubt a glorious work begun!

MARY T. GRAFT.

Georgetown, Ky. April 15, 1833.

THE good cause is opening very finely this Spring in this county. We have immersed several recently, four came forward yesterday at one of our meetings; and it seems as if we were about to have double increase to what we had last year. Our young brethren are exerting themselves to good purpose.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Fredericktown, Md. April 15, 1833.

WE have had two young men here, who say they preach the ancient gospel. They are about 24 years of age. The name of one is *Joshua Webb*, from Ohio; the other, *Samuel Jacobs*, of this state. They preached several times not far from this. There never were such gatherings on such occasions in this neighborhood. They immersed seventeen persons in the course of three days, and these of the most respectable order. They were opposed by old clergymen of the old stamp, who thought to put them down; but J. Webb beat them all with their own weapons. There was nothing the opposition could raise that

was able to stand before him in point of argument. J. Webb is to preach in this town the first of next month, and I have no doubt but there will be crowds to hear him.

JOSEPH B. WEBB.

HOWARD, Centre Co. Pa. April 15th, 1833.

THE Presbyterians in this vicinity can preach regeneration, the new birth, and every thing relative to remission of sins and an acceptance in Christ, and the creature remain as inactive as the Blue Ridge in Virginia. God does all the work, just as he spoke the universe into existence by his omnipotent fiat. This they call a harder way of being saved than in obeying the gospel. Excellent logic truly! The disciples need much encouragement in this vicinity, the sects redoubling their efforts to do that which they say God alone can do. No proclaimer of the ancient gospel but one in the county, you may easily guess the opposition he meets with. The Harbinger I believe will do much good in this part.

NATHAN J. MITCHELL.

FAYETTE, Mo. April 10, 1833.

Brother Campbell—There is a small mistake in my communication of the 9th February last, as published in the Millennial Harbinger, which must have arisen from my inattention to my diction (not expecting my communication would be published) which you will do me the favor to correct in your next number of the Harbinger.

The communication ought to have read thus:—"On *Monday* a Methodist preacher, by name W. W. Redman, in high standing in the Methodist Episcopal Church, immersed six adults near this place, *three* of whom had been sprinkled before, *and one* of the *three* had been sprinkled since thirty years of age."

J. GILL.

Hereditary Total Depravity.

IF any one desires to see an intelligible, scriptural, lucid, and irrefragable refutation of the doctrine of *total hereditary depravity*, or rather of *hereditary total depravity*, he will find it in a pamphlet recently published from Dayton, Ohio, and written by *Aylett Raines*, a brother of a good degree (*Verbum Dei Magister*) and great boldness in the faith. This faithful and laborious fellow-laborer in the kingdom of our common Lord and Saviour, has found how much the notions and speculations designated "total depravity," have operated against the reception of the gospel; and with great intellectual vigor, has laid the mattock to the root of this tree. He has not merely cut it down, but eradicated its bitter roots from the soil; so that, I think, it will never germinate in the mind of any one who gives this volume of 96 12mo. pages, a candid and faithful perusal.

EDITOR.

Letters of Recommendation.

NO cause has been more injured by a set of travelling impostors, than the cause we humbly plead. We frequently receive letters inquiring into the character and pretensions of certain persons passing themselves off for Reformers. Much injury has been done already by these hypocrites and pretended advocates of the primitive institutions. The brethren will please take this matter into their most serious consideration, and examine whether those who are *approved evangelists* ought not, when travelling out of the immediate bounds of their personal acquaintance, to have letters of recommendation, such as the churches in the apostolic age were wont to give their travelling brethren? The approved now, as in the olden time, need letters of recommendation to and

from the churches, because the honest and competent are liable to be suspected when impostors are so common. The last year's success and prosperity of the cause seems to have greatly increased these impudent pretenders; and unless precautionary measures are adopted to preserve the public and the brethren from imposition, we may expect them to increase in the ratio of the conquests of the truth. EDITOR.

The Elder's Office.

A WORK of much merit, titled, "*A Treatise on the Elder's Office; showing the Qualifications of Elders, and how the first churches obtained them; also, their Appointment, Duties, and Maintenance; the necessity of a Presbytery in every Church; and Exhortation, and the Observance of every Church Ordinance on the Lord's Day, amongst other ends, to the obtaining of Elders*—By *William Ballantine;*"—is now almost out of press. It is *being* printed and *shall have been* printed and published in a few days. It was written many years since, is now a little revised, and with a few notes from the publisher, makes a treatise of about 72 pages, the size of this work. It will be sold at 25 cents. A few copies can be sent per order in the boxes containing Testaments. It is worthy of the perusal of all who wish to understand the nature of the Elder's or Bishop's office, and the discipline of a Christian congregation. It answers many questions which have been propounded to us on these matters, in a way which must commend itself to the understanding of the intelligent.

EDITOR.

☞THE brethren who visit Philadelphia from the West, are informed that the disciples who have resolved to keep the ordinances of Jesus Christ, as delivered by the Holy Apostles, hold their weekly meetings in Bank street, in that city. Our venerable and beloved brother *Ballantine* presides over and edifies this little congregation in the great city. *Ed.*

Christian College.

WE are glad to learn that some of the by-laws of the *Christian College* are about to be amended, and that it will be a purely literary institution. This will explain our not publishing them at this time. As a *literary* institution, liberal and antisectarian, we wish it all success. *Ed.*

☞WE are now forwarding the *Family Testament* as fast as bound, in reference to the dates of the orders received; which is the rule proposed in distributing the work, as far as conveniencies for transportation offer.

ERRATUM.—By some strange casualty a whole line from some other page appears between lines 7 and 8 from top of page 201. The words "*skillful application of causes as will produce such effects as unguided,*" were interposed from another page before "the faith of the original gospel." It is fortunately in a larger type.

☞Communications from *Philalethes*, and a reply to one of his by A. B. G. unexpectedly have been crowded out of this number.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Number VI.——Volume IV.

Bethany, Va. June, 1833.

Special Providence and Spiritual Agency.

WELLSBURG, Va. May 5th, 1833.

Dear Sir,

I THANK you for your friendly and (in some respects) satisfactory reply to the letter I addressed to you on the subject of a *special providence* and *spiritual agency.* I am truly glad that you "do not belong to the school" of philosophers who deny a special providence. Since I reflected on the subject of religion it has always appeared to me that a denial of a *special* providence is inconsistent with a belief in *revelation.* Yet, my dear sir, how many of those who profess a belief in revelation scout at the idea of God's interposing in answer to prayer! If the praying attribute their deliverance from temptation or calamity, to the superintending care of Heaven, they are charged with enthusiasm. If the pulpit attribute famine or pestilence to the *immediate* interposition of Heaven, many who profess to be philosophers cry out, "What ignorance of the laws of nature!"

If health permit, and I can have the privilege of your paper, I shall endeavor to show your readers that such professed philosophers are more enthusiastical than the most vulgar of religionists. What is enthusiasm, but to believe without evidence? If God never, by a special agency, interposed in the concerns of men, then I say, prayer is foolish, inconsistent, and absurd. If all events in the moral and physical world are brought about by laws established when the world was made, our duty is patiently to submit after we have wisely, to the extent of our ability, exerted our power;—to call on God for assistance is, indeed, *superstition.*

In the early part of my ministry I commenced a careful investigation of this important subject, and it has occupied much of my attention from *that time.* While I was inquiring for light, my good mother put into my hands *Sherlock on Providence.* This masterly work greatly increased my stock of knowledge on the moral government of God. It is by far the most valuable work of the kind I ever saw. Permit me, dear sir, to recommend it to the attention of your readers.

It is not a metaphysical theory or hypothesis, but a scriptural view of God's government over our world. Our pious and ingenious Dean shows that, according to the Bible, God's agency is perpetual in the government of men. He uses his knowledge of the philosophy of mind and matter not to establish a theory of his own invention, but to obviate objections which are urged by vain men against the scheme of moral government revealed in the Bible. And this is the province of philosophy; for on this subject she can originate nothing; it is too high—she cannot attain to it. "The efficient cause of the operations of nature," says the great Dr. Reed, "is unknown. Natural philosophers, by great attention to the course of nature, have discovered many of her laws; but they have never discovered the *efficient* cause of any one of her phenomena. Upon the theatre of nature we see innumerable effects which require an agent endowed with active *power;* but the agent is behind the scenes. Whether this be the supreme cause alone, or a subordinate *cause* or *causes*; and if subordinate causes be employed by the Almighty, what their nature, their number, and their different offices may be, are things hid, for wise reasons no doubt, from the human eye."

Here, then, dear sir, it seems we are left by the inductive philosopher—the efficient cause of nature's operations is unknown. Now where philosophy leaves us revelation takes us up. Where the dim light of science fails, the lamp of revelation sends her needed aid:—

> "The things unknown by feeble sense,
> Unseen by reason's glimm'ring ray,
> With strong commanding evidence
> Their heavenly origin display."

In "Sherlock on Providence" your readers will see an instructive illustration of all the attributes of our Heavenly Father in the moral government of the world. On the sovereignty and goodness of Providence our author is peculiarly happy and instructive. He shows, in the most convincing manner, that God can dispose of all events as a wise and good sovereign, without destroying the freedom of the will.

I consider it a great misfortune that this work is not more generally known. Many years ago I recommended it to the notice of the Ohio Annual Conference, and our Book Agent at Cincinnati was ordered to publish two thousand copies. This is, I believe, the only impression made in *America*. By a careful perusal of Sherlock, in connexion with the Bible and other books of a similar description, your readers will come to see the hand of God in all the events of life, and to "rejoice because the Lord God omnipotent reigns."

I say again, I rejoice that you admit the doctrine of a special providence. You think that it is carried on by the ministry of angels. That these heavenly beings are often employed on errands of mercy and judgment to our world is certain from *revelation;* but I think we should not limit special and spiritual agency to angelic ministry—I do not know that you do. You say that good and bad angels may make impressions on our minds—may influence us by suggestion and motive But is this admission consistent with your assertion that "all

the converting power of the Holy Spirit is in the word," and that we can only be moved by *words*, and that they must be written or spoken? When I wrote to you before I had not seen that part of your essay on the Holy Spirit, in which you reply to the objections of a Mr. Broaddus. It appears from your reply that he understood you (as I have done) to say that in the business of salvation we have no assistance but what is afforded us in the written word; that this is the argument of the Holy Spirit. But you certainly have a right to explain yourself—and in a subsequent essay I will endeavor to show your readers what great things may be done for men through the medium of impression, suggestion, and motive, and that there is an *influence out of the word* that will assist us in the business of our salvation.

In addressing you this scroll I had no object in view but the advancement of *truth*. By an interchange of thoughts on this important subject I hope good may be done. Not that I am so vain as to suppose that I can instruct you on this or any other subject; but, perhaps, some of your readers who have not had your advantages, may be benefitted by my views of the subjects:—at all events, I hope to understand you.

If there should be some difference in our views, I hope it will not be essential. Mutual charity is due to each other in all cases where error is involuntary. In this dark state of being our knowledge of heavenly things is imperfect—we know in part. But, thanks be to God, a time is coming when our views of God and glory will be greatly enlarged—when we shall *see* as we are *seen*, and *know* as we are *known*. Until that time comes, let us cultivate charity, or love; for this *shall never fail*.

Yours sincerely,

J. A. WATERMAN.

Reply to Mr. J. A. Waterman.

Dear Sir,

YOUR commendations of *Sherlock* I think are well deserved. They are not exaggerated. He is a writer of good sense, and has chosen a very interesting subject. As far as I have perused his work, it appears to be well adapted to refute the scepticism of some professors on the doctrine of special providence. It would be well if our philosophists, who disbelieve the superintending care of the Almighty Father, would give Sherlock a candid hearing.

This is a doubting age. Philosophy is proud and arrogant. She assumes too much. She cannot originate a spiritual idea. She steals from the Bible her best thoughts, and would palm them on the world as her own inventions. She seeks to find a cause for every thing in her own arcana, and discards revelation because it eclipses her glory. I should be glad to see you strip her of her borrowed attire, and exhibit her in her own nakedness when she presumes to be a moralist. She is a useful handmaid in the kitchen, and can do something in the workship; but in the pulpit she is superlatively awkward and immo-

dest. "The earth cannot bear a servant when he reigns, nor a handmaid that would be heir to her mistress;" nor can I philosophy, when she presumes to originate spiritual ideas, or denies the special interpositions of Heaven in the affairs of mankind.

It will not only be gratifying to me, but, I doubt not, pleasing to my readers, to hear you expose the arrogance of those professed philosophers, who assign to the sole operation of the laws of nature, every blessing and every curse that falls upon mankind. They are, indeed, "more enthusiastic than the most vulgar of religionists."

I do not affirm it as my conviction that all "special providences," as they are called, are carried on exclusively by the ministry of angels. I do believe that much has been done, and still is done by them. "They are *all* ministering spirits sent forth to attend the heirs of salvation." We believe, I say, that much has been done by them; and besides, they seem to be just that sort of agents wanting to preserve order in a system of general laws, both physical and moral, operating on voluntary agents.

Concerning suggestions, impressions, and motives by spiritual agencies, little can be known with certainty, except the fact that such suggestions and impressions have been made on human minds. But you think that such a belief is inconsistent with the proposition that "*all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is in the word.*" This proposition I hold to be of much importance in reference to this age of mysticism and mystic influences; and, therefore, I deem it worthy of profound examination. You will please observe that the proposition affirms no more than that all the *moral* power (argument, motive, or converting power) of the Holy Spirit is now in the word. It is *converting* power, or that power of turning the mind of man to love, admire, and delight in objects before unknown and unappreciated, of which we speak.

Now, in the nature of things, as a philosopher would say, before we can love, admire, or delight in any thing, it must be introduced to our acquaintance; we must know a person before we can love or admire him. Knowledge, then, precedes all love, admiration, and delight. And what is knowledge but an acquaintance with persons and things? If we love and admire one whom we have never seen, (of which we are capable,) his character must be known; and this brings us to the last question—How can a character be revealed or made known to us but by words, or signs equivalent to words? If there be any other way of revealing a person or character, not submitted to our senses, I wish to be informed of it. Till that information is communicated to me, I must reason from such data as I have: and from these data I am constrained to conclude that faith comes by hearing, and knowledge from communication of ideas by their proper representatives.

But angels, good or evil, do not talk with us. Then they are not sent to convert us! But they can impress us, or make suggestions; and what are these? Not words, or we could hear them; not visible signs, or we could see them; not sensible impressions, or we could feel them. How, then, can they influence us to good or evil? Still it

is possible! By assuming a form of some sort—the form of a man—of any creature—of a thought—of a word, and by presenting it to the outward senses; or by an acquaintance with our associations of ideas, our modes of reasoning, our passions, our appetites, our propensities—and by approaching us through these avenues, they lead us backwards or forwards, to the right or the left, as their designs may require. This is possible, and compatible with our views of spiritual influence. It is more than possible—it is probable. I might advance farther, and say it is certain; for it has been done. Satan assumed the form of a serpent, and talked with our mother before he influenced her to act according to his views. The first evil angelic influence exerted upon our race was by assuming an appropriate form, and in that form addressing the passions through the understanding by intelligible signs or words. This fact alone sustains our views of angelic influence, and the mode of operation. The tempter had considered the human constitution—the female character. He had become a philosopher before he planned his attack. He proceeded in accordance with our nature, and put forth his converting power in language. He converted Eve to himself; and now the conversion of our souls to God is effected by moral, and not physical influence.*

We need not attempt to explain how Satan takes hold of the wind, nor how the demons entered into the swine. We believe that angels can operate on matter as well as on mind. An angel struck Peter on his side, awaked him, knocked off his chains, and opened for him iron gates. But this is foreign to our purpose. It is *moral* power or motive of which we are now speaking. And we have seen that no argument can move unless it be understood; and before it can be understood it must be addressed to our apprehension.

When we say that we can be moved morally, or only by words, and that they must be written or spoken, we include all stipulated signs: for we thus sometimes use the term *word* and the term *language.*

When Paul says, "Faith comes by hearing," it would be rather a pun than an argument to say, How, then, can the deaf and dumb obtain faith? We know that the deaf and dumb do believe, and that they have faith: yet they have not hearing. When, then, we say that we can only be moved by words, and that words must be spoken or written, we do not exclude the deaf, the dumb, and the blind from the influence of motive. Words, or signs equivalent to words, however, must always be the currency of thought, of moral argument, and motive; and these signs must be addressed to the mental eye or ear.

To those unacquainted with the art and mystery of teaching the deaf and dumb the art of reading and communicating ideas in words spelled and written by their own fingers, it will at first appear quite as mysterious as the *modus operandi* of angels or spirits in communicating impressions, suggestions, and motives to the minds of men. Indeed, I think there is much analogy between the art of making impressions on the minds of the deaf and dumb, and of communicating

*See essays on Metaphysical Regeneration, Mill. Harb. vol. 1, pages 454, 481, 536, 568. Read, especially, No. 2, page 481.

suggestions and moral arguments to them, and the mode of operating of spiritual agents in their intercourse with men.

There is no communicating to any intelligent creature the knowledge of things unknown, but by the knowledge of things known. There must be some groundwork, something by which to institute comparison, similitude, or analogy, and thus lead on the mind to higher and more abstract knowledge.

But this is more than enough for you, my dear sir, and most of our readers, on the reasons and considerations which justify our belief in the influence of angels on the minds and persons of men. I must still refer to the conversations in progress of publication, which occurred in Samuel Goodal's, for further developments of this agency.

But that the converting power of the Holy Spirit is now presented to us in the written word, needs not to be proved by arguments *a priori*—by arguments drawn from the reason and nature of things, but by the declarations found in the written word itself, and by the declarations of all who have been converted to a holy and a happy life.

"The word of God is living and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." "All scripture given by divine inspiration is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, conviction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for every good work." "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, *which are able to make you wise to salvation* through the faith in Jesus Christ." It is "the sword of the Spirit." "It is like a hammer that breaks in pieces the rock." "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." So speaks the Spirit of its own word.

And what say the converted? When they tell the story of their new birth from first to last, what is it but the recital of the power of some truth derived from what is written in the book? Were they moved by fear, drawn by love, or allured by hope? Was it not the fear of something, the love of something, the hope of something which was communicated by the Apostles and Prophets, suggested through them to the mind by the Holy Spirit? The experience of every Christian is but the proof of all the divine commendation of the light, life, and efficacy of the word of God. It proves that it is able to make alive, to save and to destroy.

There is a sect of religious philosophers, to which I think you do not belong, who teach that the reason why A believes and B does not, is owing to the special operation of the Spirit on the former, and its inoperation on the latter. These make void the word of God, and teach its impotency by representing it as a *dead* letter until the Spirit makes the sinner alive, though they sometimes talk of its *killing* folks in some mysterious way and manner.

Between the Calvinist and the Arminian there is no difference, in my judgment, on the five points, worth a hard thought or an unkind feeling, if they both agree that some sovereign, non-descript, independent spiritual or special agency is necessary to make the word of God

credible, or to enable any sinner to believe it. Agreeing in this point, all the rest is but a war of words.

But I have formed a higher opinion of your judgment and biblical attainments, than to suppose that you believe in new revelations, or a revelation upon a revelation; and that while you contend for special providences and special interpositions in behalf of men, on the part of the moral Governor of the world, however that agency may be carried on, you discard the doctrine of the unintelligibility of God's testimony and of the necessity of some non-descript new revelation, of injected faith, and independent physical operations upon the mind of unbelievers.

I thank you for your recommendation of Sherlock, and will extract some of the marrow and fatness of it, as far as convenience permits. I hope soon to hear from you again.

In all sincerity, I remain, &c.

EDITOR.

Sherlock on Divine Providence.

[CONTINUED.]

THUS God intended to deliver Israel out of Egypt by the hands of Moses. Moses was born at a time when the king of Egypt had commanded that every son that was born to the Israelites should be cast into the river. His mother hid him three months, and not being able to conceal him any longer, exposed him in an ark of bulrushes among the flags by the river side. Pharaoh's daughter came down to wash herself in the river, and finds the ark with the child in it—puts him to his own mother to nurse, whereby he came to know his own kindred and relations, and to be instructed in the knowledge and worship of the God of Israel. Afterwards Pharaoh's daughter takes him home and breeds him up as her own son, whereby he was instructed in all the learning of Egypt, and in all the policies of Pharaoh's court, which qualified him for government. When he was forty years old, he had lived long enough in Pharaoh's court, and God thought fit to remove him into better company, and to accustom him to a more severe life; and this was done by as strange an accident. He slew an Egyptian in defence of an oppressed Jew, and was betrayed by his own brethren, and forced to fly from Pharaoh to save his own life, till the time was come for the deliverance of Israel, and then God sent him back into Egypt to bring his people out from thence with signs and wonders and a mighty hand.

Thus God had foretold Ahab by the prophet Micaiah, that if he went up against Ramoth Gilead, he should perish there; and this was accomplished by a very great chance. For "a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king between the joints of the harness," of which he died. 1 Kings xxii. 34. The blood which came from his wound ran into the chariot, and one washed the chariot in the pool of Samaria, and the dogs licked up his blood; which was a

very casual thing, and little thought of by him who did it, and yet fulfilled God's threatening against Ahab: "In the place where dog's licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." ch. xxi. verse 29.

I shall add but one example more of this nature, and it is a very remarkable one: God's deliverance of the Jews in the days of Esther, from the wicked conspiracy of Haman. This Haman being advanced to great power and authority by king Ahasuerus, took great offence at Mordecai the Jew, who refused to reverence him as others did; and for his sake obtained a decree from the king to destroy all the Jews in the provinces of his dominions. Mordecai sends to queen Esther to go to the king, and to petition him about this matter. This was a very hazardous attempt, it being death by the law for any person, man or woman, to go to the king without being called, unless the king held out his golden sceptre to them. But the queen at last, after three days fasting, ventured her own life to save her people, and obtained favor in the king's sight, who held out the golden sceptre to her. All that she requested at that time was, that the king and Haman would come to the banquet which she had prepared. And being then asked what her petition was, with an assurance that it should be granted, she begged that the king and Haman would come the next day also to her banquet, and then she would declare it. Haman was much exalted with the king's favor, and that queen Esther had admitted none to banquet with the king but himself. But still Mordecai, who refused to bow before him, was a great grievance; and by the advice of his friends he built a gallows fifty cubits high, and resolved that night to beg of the king that Mordecai might be hanged on it, and had he come in time his petition had been certainly granted. But it so happened that that very night the king could not sleep, and he called for the book of the records of the chronicles, and there they found written that Mordecai had discovered the treason of two of the king's chamberlains against him; and finding upon inquiry that he had never been rewarded for it, he resolved to do him honor, and made Haman who was at the door to beg that Mordecai might be hanged, his minister in doing him honor. This prepared the king to grant queen Esther's request, and hanged Haman upon the gallows he had built for Mordecai, and preserved the Jews from that destruction he had designed against them. And thus it is almost in all the remarkable passages of Providence. There is so much appearance of chance and accident which has the greatest stroke in some wonderful events, as may satisfy considering men that the world is governed by a divine wisdom and counsel, and an invisible power, and that the immediate and visible causes have always the least hand in it.

For can we think otherwise when we see as many visible marks of wisdom, and goodness, and justice in what we call chance, as in any other acts of Providence. Nay, when the wisdom of Providence is principally seen in the government of fortuitous events—when we see a world wisely made, though we did not see it made, yet we conclude that it was not made by chance, but by a wise being. And by

the same reason, when we see accidental events, nay, a long incoherent series of accidents concur to the producing the most admirable effects, we ought to conclude that there is a wise invisible hand which governs chance, which of itself can do nothing wisely. When the lives and fortunes of men, the fate of kingdoms and empires, the successes of war, the changes of government, are so often determined and brought about by the most visible accidents—when chance defeats the wisest counsels and the greatest power—when good men are rewarded and the church of God preserved by appearing chances—when bad men are punished by chance, and the very chance whereby they are punished carries the marks of their sins upon it for which they are punished—I say, can any man in such cases think that all this is mere chance? When, how accidental soever the means are, or appear to be, whereby such things are done, there is no appearance at all of chance in the event. But the changes and revolutions, the rewards and punishments of chance are all as wisely done as if there had been nothing of chance and accident in it. This is the great security of our lives amidst all the uncertainties of fortune, that chance itself cannot hurt us without a divine commission. This is a sure foundation of faith, and hope, and trust in God, how calamitous and desperate soever our external condition seems to be, that God never wants means to help—that he has a thousand unseen ways, a whole army of accidents and unexpected events at command to disappoint such designs, which no visible art or power can disappoint, and to save those whom no visible power can save.

This is an undeniable reason for a perpetual awe and reverence of God, and an entire submission to him, and a devout acknowledgment of him in all our ways, that we have no security but in his providence and protection. For whatever provision we can make against foreseen and foreknown evils, we can never provide against chance. That is wholly in God's hands, and no human wit or strength can withstand it; which may abate the pride and self-confidence of men, and teach the rich, and great, and mighty a religious veneration of God, who can with so much ease pull down the mighty from their seat, and advance those of low degree.

3. The next thing to be explained is God's government of moral causes or free agents; that is, the government of men considered as the instruments of Providence which God makes use of for the accomplishment of his own wise counsels.

Most of the good or evil which happens to us in this world is done by men. If God reward, or if he punish us, usually men are his ministers, both to execute his vengeance, and to dispense his blessings. And therefore God must have as absolute a government over mankind, of all their thoughts, and passions, and counsels and actions, as he has of the powers and influences of natural causes, or else he cannot reward and punish when and as he pleases. If men could hurt those whom God would bless and reward, or do good to those whom God would punish, both good and bad men might be happy or miserable in this world whether God would or not. Our fortunes

would depend upon the numbers and power of our friends or enemies, upon the good or bad humors and inclinations of those among whom we live, and Providence could not help us.

Now this is the great difficulty, how God can exercise such an absolute government over mankind who are free agents, without destroying the liberty and freedom of their choice, which would destroy the nature of virtue and vice, of rewards and punishments. The necessity of allowing this, if we will acknowledge a Providence, and the plain testimonies and examples of this absolute and uncontrolable government which we find in Scripture, have made some men deny the liberty of human actions, and represent mankind to be as mere machines as a watch or a clock, which move as they are moved. And then they know not how to bring religion and the moral differences of good and evil, and the natural justice of rewards and punishments into their scheme; for nothing of all this can be reconciled with absolute necessity and fate. Others, to avoid these difficulties, are afraid of attributing too much to Providence, or have such confused and perplexed notions about it, that there are few cases wherein they can securely depend on God.

But I think this difficulty will be easily removed if we distinguish between God's government of men, as reasonable creatures and free agents, and his government of them as the instruments of Providence. The first consider them in their own private and natural capacity; the second, in relation to the rest of mankind, which makes a great difference in the reason and in the acts of government.

Man, considered in his nature, is a reasonable creature and free agent; and therefore the proper government of man consists in giving him laws, that he may know the difference between good and evil, what he ought to choose and what to refuse, and in annexing such rewards and punishments to the observation or to the breach of these laws, as may reasonably invite him to obedience, and deter him from sin; and as this degenerate state requires, in laying such external restraints on him, and affording him such internal assistances of grace, as the divine wisdom sees proportioned to the weakness and corruption of human nature: and when this is done, it behoves God to leave him to his own choice, and to reward or punish him as he deserves; for a forced virtue deserves no reward, and a necessity of sinning will reasonably excuse from punishment. The nature of a reasonable creature, of virtue and vice, of rewards and punishments, represent it as very becoming the wisdom and justice of God, to leave every man to the freedom of his own choice, to do good or evil, to deserve rewards or punishments, as far as he himself is only concerned in it.

But when we consider man in society, the case is altered; for when the good or evil of their actions extend beyond themselves, to do good or hurt to other men, the Providence of God becomes concerned either to hinder, or to permit and order it, as may best serve the wise ends of government, as those other men who are like to be the better or the worse for it, have deserved well or ill of God. Though God has made man a free agent, yet we must not think that he has made such a

creature as he himself cannot govern. No man doubts, but that God can, when he pleases, by an irresistible power, turn men's hearts, and chain up their passions, and alter their counsels. The only question is, When it is fit for God to do this; and no man can question the goodness of it, when the good government of the world requires it. God makes no man good or bad, virtuous or vicious, by a perpetual and irresistible force; for this contradicts the nature of virtue and vice, which requires a freedom and liberty of choice; but God may, by a secret and irresistible influence upon men's minds, even force them to do that good which they have no inclination to do, and restrain them from doing that evil which otherwise they would have done, which does not make them good men, but makes them the instruments of Providence in doing good to men: and God, who is the sovereign Lord of all creatures, may, when he sees fit, press those men, if I may so speak, to his service, who would not do good upon choice. This shows the difference between the government of grace, and Providence: the first has relation to virtue and vice, to make men good, to change their natures and sinful inclinations into habits of virtue, and therefore admits of no greater force than what is consistent with the freedom of choice, and the nature of virtue and vice: but the government of Providence respects the external happiness or misery, rewards or punishments of men or nations; and to this purpose God may use what instruments he pleases, and exercise such authority over nature or men as is necessary to accomplish his own wise counsels of mercy or judgment. And it was necessary to premise this distinction, because the confounding of these two has occasioned great difficulties and mistakes, both in the doctrine of grace and providence.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A. B. G. to Philalethes.

MR. EDITOR,

Dear Sir,

IN the first number of volume 4, I took the liberty to propose two or three questions for the consideration of your correspondent *Philalethes*, which appears to have provoked in him a wrong spirit, and he seems to find it easier to sneer than answer. Not deeming it expedient to recriminate, but choosing rather to search after truth, I will now proceed to review my former queries, and statements, and his remarks, just hinting to him, however, that one fact is preferable to two witticisms; and that men sometimes resort to ridicule simply because they have no other resort.

My first question was, that he would point me out to the place in scripture where it was told us that *Adam* was made in the image of God. He declares that the fact is *asserted* and *recorded* in *express* terms in Gen. i. 27. I have looked, and cannot find the word *Adam* in the chapter at all. In the 26th verse God says, "Let us make *man after* our likeness," &c. and in the next verse is a record that it was

done; in addition to which it is stated that they were created *male* and *female.* Now unless God exists as male and female, according to the theory of the Shakers, *Adam*, which was their plural name, as male and female, (see chap. v. verse 2.) was not created as the image of God, nor intended to represent him; and Moses, in Deut. 4th, 12th, 15th, and 16th, conveys the idea that God had not given forth any likeness or similitude of himself, lest they should make an idol after it; and as Paul states in Rom. v. 11th, that Adam was the figure or image of him that was to come, it appears plain to me still, after all Philalethes has said, that Adam was made in the image or after the likeness of Jesus Christ, who was the only true image of God and the brightness of his glory. And as the church was contained in him as a wife, and was to be, and is, "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh," this union of twain was represented in the creation and formation of the natural or earthy man. For the woman was created in him, and formed of him, and "*their* name was called *Adam.*" As the image or figure of Christ and the church. Compare Gen. ii. 23, 24, with Eph. v. 30, 31, 32. the church not then made manifest, but contained in Christ, in like manner as the first woman was contained in the natural body of the first man. But possibly Philalethes thinks he has forestalled this argument by his round assertion that the Son of God had no body till 4000 years afterwards. But John has recorded that he was the "beginning of the creation of God." Certainly, then, if God created nothing before him, he was before Adam; and as I can no where learn that God created part of Christ at one time and part at another, especially as Christ himself says in the Psalms, "A body *hast* thou prepared me," not a body thou *wilt* prepare me; and as he appeared to Abraham and Joshua, and talked with them, and eat with the former, I must withhold my assent to Philalethes' theory till he brings more substantial proofs of its soundness, in addition to the above, see Eph. iv. 10. and John vi. 62. As to his declaration that Christ assumed human nature, I am so far behind the modern theological march of mind, as not even to have a Bible which contains a record of such a fact, or of any fact from which such a deduction can be made without violence. I therefore leave this part of the subject, and proceed to remark on his proofs of man's immortality. And first, he points us to Rom. ii. 7. where it is recorded that some by patient continuance in well doing were *seeking for immortality.* Really, this is most singular evidence that they were naturally immortal! The next is 1 Cor. xv. 53. where the Apostle asserts that this MORTAL shall put on *immortality*, and yet Philalethes adduces it to prove that we have no need to put on immortality from the fact that we are already immortal by nature. He then brings in 2 Tim. i. x. and this expressly asserts (he says) the immortality of the *human being.* In answer to this, I affirm, that it no more asserts it, than it asserts infant sprinkling to be a command of God; and I appeal to every reader, candid or uncandid, to examine the text. It is evident from his reasoning that he misapprehends the import of the word; for he has got two sorts of immortality—one of which is destructible and liable to corruption and decay. A corruptible immortality would be like a

short eternal life. Philalethes seems to confound death, or mortality, with annihilation; and the being upheld by the power of God in some form of existence, he concludes must constitute immortality. But I conceive that immortality is one form, or mode of existence, and death another; and annihilation is ceasing to exist in any form. The children of God, his saints, are made partakers of the '*divine nature*,' which is immortal. But the wicked, though they may exist forever, are no where in Scripture said to be immortal; but their final state is the second *death*. I would recommend to Philalethes to give the matter itself and the Scriptures he has quoted in support of it, a second consideration; and to recollect that censorious reflections are no arguments, and carry no conviction to an opponent, but that of the folly of him who makes them.

I will now note some "productions" of his, as rare as any of mine, and quite as fanciful. And first, the newly discovered theory that Christ's body, at the time of his death, was just become an unsuitable habitation of his spirit, and that Christ only half died for our sins; and that the sons of Adam, or "Adam and his progeny," were, and are, only half mortal. He takes the argument that Christ used to prove the resurrection of the dead, to prove that there is no need of a resurrection at all; for that which never dies cannot rise again: of course Christ only half rose from the dead, and *hades* only means a graveyard.

What was done to the body of Christ to make it a proper habitation for his spirit on its return, Philalethes does not tell us; nor what we are to understand by the *living* part of a *dead* man, or what sort of a resurrection he believes in, or what death is, or if the soul or spirit of man is secure in its native immortality, how the gift of God (which is "*eternal life*,") can benefit any thing but the body. The Presbyterians tell us that Adam was made in the "*moral*" image of God, and Philalethes tells us of a "*mental*" image. What is a mental image? The image of a thing is that by which it is represented to our view. That which cannot be seen is no image. The disposition or moral character of God, and his intellectual powers are as plainly seen in his other works as in man. If Philalethes thinks otherwise, will he tell us why or how a thing which cannot be seen can be the image of a thing invisible? for the intellect of a man is just as invisible as that of God

If the above extracts of Philalethes' doctrine or theory are not proofs that he owns as good a "cobweb wheel" as myself, I will send you on another sample. If I hold any error on these subjects it harms me more than any body, and I sincerely desire to be free from it. For this very cause, therefore, I put my first questions, and have added these remarks. If Philalethes has any light on the subject, I shall rejoice to see it shine. But he must have a better apprehension of the subject, and of the Scriptures, than appears in his last, or I shall remain in my ignorance. Farewell. A. B. G.

P. S.—If the reading of Beattie's letters and Campbell's works tend to free the mind from bigotry, I would recommend to Philalethes to give them a second perusal.

Paidobaptism---again.

"Pedobaptism Examined, or the Scriptural Evidences in relation to the subject of Baptism, considered. To which is prefixed an Essay under the title of the Mask Removed. Being designed to check rashness and promote mutual forbearance between Christians having an honest difference of sentiment. To which is added, an Appendix, containing a few quotations from history and the writings of the ancient fathers.—By *Allen H. Mathes*. Madisonville, Tennessee, 1833."

AT the request of a friend who forwarded this tract of 60 pages, we have given it a perusal. The writer is not void of good sense, nor of a respectable share of ingenuity. Under the head of "THE MASK REMOVED," he has said some very good common place things about true and false zeal—on liberality and bigotry. This engrosses the one-fifth of the pamphlet. More than the next fifth is taken up with the long discussed and much vexed question, Whether John's baptism and the Christian baptism be the same? He very satisfactorily demonstrates that they are not the same—that John was not a preacher nor baptizer under the Christian dispensation, but the proclaimer of the approaching kingdom.

On the question, For what purpose Jesus was immersed or baptized by John? he is not so satisfactory. He would have him baptized to fulfil a part of the law of righteousness, for the consecration of the Messiah as a priest; never suspecting the gross fallacy that there never was a law of righteousness for making a Jew a Levite, or for consecrating one of the house of Judah into a son of Levi. How could Jesus fulfil the righteousness of a law of consecration, which law never existed; and, indeed, the law of consecration said nothing concerning the priesthood of a son of Judah? No man takes this honor to himself. Even Christ glorified himself not by assuming the Aaronic priesthood. But God glorified him with a priesthood not from Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedeck. Yet our "Pedobaptist friend" would make him a priest according to the law of a carnal commandment and of the house of Aaron!! These Paidobaptists are always confounding flesh and spirit, nature and religion, Judaism and Christianity, and this babyism of sprinkling infants to dedicate them without the graces of faith, repentance, and a new heart, is the illusion that deludes them into this devious logic. In other respects they are men of good sense; but in this they dishonor their own intellect as much as they discredit the Holy Apostles.

Our zealous friend Mr. Mathes next proceeds to the "mode of baptism." The mode of baptism! The modes are three: Sprinkling, pouring, dipping! The sprinkling mode of immersion, the pouring mode of immersion, and the dipping mode of immersion! or say it signifies sprinkling;—then we have the sprinkling mode of sprinkling, the pouring mode of sprinkling, and the dipping mode of sprinkling. There is a bushel of sophistry in this very word *mode!* It has beguiled thousands. The Baptists, too, contributed to it themselves: for it was universal among them till our debate on baptism in 1820; since which time it has been on the wane.

Our friend, however, is very liberal. Like Solomon's woman he says, "Let it be neither mine nor thine, but *divide* it." You may take the dipping mode of sprinkling, and I will take the sprinkling mode of sprinkling. Call me a good Christian, and I will say you are a very good Christian.

He proceeds to show that the Greek language was so barren of definite terms that Jesus Christ could not find a word which would express *the action* he meant when he said "Baptize them." And, then, Jerusalem was so void of watering places, though frequently nearly a million of persons were assembled in the city and its environs, there was not as much water as would suffice for covering a man's body. There were several pools, he admits; but then the Jews would not permit any man to be immersed in them. They had no other water to drink. And as for Siloam, he forgot to say that the diseased were sometimes immersed there.

But this is not the worst of it. The preposition *eis* settles nothing: for it will neither lead a person *into* heaven, nor *into* the grave; but only *to* heaven and *to* the grave; and it must remain a doubt to the end of time whether any of our race can ascend higher than *to* heaven, or descend lower than *to* hell; for *eis* only led Philip and the Eunuch *to* the water, and the thousands *to* the Jordan, but not *into* it!! This old fable is told over as it has been told a thousand times, till one would think that the gentleman believes it himself. But on this part of the book, which engrosses other two-fifths of it, so perfectly ridiculous, we delay not. The reader will see in the present number that Mr. Mathes is confronted by one of the most learned Paidobaptists in America in a work just from the press.

There is one sensible passage in this part of the pamphlet, which, in justice to the writer, we shall quote; because it shows that if he had not been deluded in his infancy, he might have written like a man:—

"Our translation, though in the general a good one, is in many places a little wanting in accuracy; certainly no man will pretend that it is infallible, or that it ought to be followed where it differs from the language that inspiration penned, merely because it was brought into common use by the authority of the King of England. I am aware that there are persons in the world who very liberally charge a man with altering the Scriptures, when he gives a translation to any text, no matter how correct his translation may be; if it do not suit their notions, it is sufficient evidence to condemn it; although such may not know a letter in the alphabet, they are critics enough in Greek to know how to pronounce it wrong. Reader, if any part of the Scripture should be translated inaccurately, must we believe and teach that inaccuracy, merely because our translators said so? Were you to judge of the water of any fountain, would you drink of the fountain, or out of the stream? Again, when you charge a man with changing the Scriptures, do you do it from knowledge or prejudice? With a design to serve the cause of truth, or your own opinions? Will a man who honestly desires the success of truth, condemn any thing as false, when he does not know it to be so? Is it a genuine mark of Christian candor to assert a thing he knows nothing about? Then never condemn a man for altering the Scripture, until you can prove that he has done it, lest you fix the seal of bigotry to yourself; for none but a bigot blindly contends for that he knows nothing about."

Had any Reformer said this much about King James' version, Messrs. Cleland, Jennings, or some other very *learned* Paidobaptist would have denounced him as an incorrigible heretic, and as not liking the common version because it did not like him. Indeed, on the subject of baptism the common version is very far from pleasing these Doctors: judge, then, how much more they must dislike the new one because *baptism* is translated in it.

The remaining part of the pamphlet is taken up with *the subjects* of baptism; and these, of course, are babes. Our author is modest here. He takes the *households* for the proper subjects, and he can find infants in Lydia's, and Cornelius', and the Jailor's households. He almost can hear them crying when Peter and Paul are sprinkling water upon their faces. He gives us a slice of church history in the appendix, indicating that infant affusion was known in the times of Ireneus and Origen! EDITOR.

Worcester on the Atonement.

[*The following remarks upon this work are addressed by Thomas Campbell, Sen. to William Z. Thompson, of Kentucky; by whom a copy of it was forwarded to this office. They were designed only for the eye of brother Thompson; but on reading this letter, we concluded they might be of use to some of our readers.*] Ed.

BETHANY, *Brooke Co. Va.* April 10, 1833.

I CANNOT propose in the compass of a letter to present you with a formal review of this work; nor, indeed, do I think it necessary: for in so doing I should find much to approve; but merely to point out what I conceive to be the radical mistakes of the author, by a direct appeal to express scripture testimony.

Noah Worcester, in his introduction, page 3, declares that his principal object in writing, was, "to evince that, in the sacrifice of Christ, there was a display of love, not of wrath." Page 141, "If God has no pleasure in the death or sufferings of the wicked, he surely could have none in the sufferings of his Son." But what saith the Prophet? "It pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief." Isaiah liii. 10. "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man, my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand on the little ones." Zech. xiii. 7. with Matth. xxvi. 31. And again, Rom. viii. 32, "He that *spared not* his own Son, but *delivered him up* for us all, how will he not with him also freely give us all things?" And Matth. xxvi. 38, 39. "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even to death; and he fell on his face and prayed, saying, O, my Father, if it be *possible*, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as *I will*, but as *thou wilt*." But we see that, according to the divine will, it was not possible;—that he suffered all that was predicted concerning him, Luke xxiv. 44. and that without the shedding of his blood there was no remission. See Heb. ix. 22. and x. 4. Here, then, we have the greatest possible dis-

play of love both in the giver and in the gift—both in the Father and in the Son; connected with the greatest possible display of aversion to the sufferings, on the part of the Son, and of complacential unsparing severity in inflicting them, on the part of the Father; for "it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he put him to grief;" when he made his soul an offering for sin, "he spared him not." Moreover, it seems impossible to have been otherwise, if sin were pardoned, "for without the shedding of his blood there was no remission;" therefore it was shed for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, that the called, namely, under that covenant, might receive the promise of an eternal inheritance. Heb. ix. 16. This being the case, it necessarily follows, that, in exact proportion to the divine good pleasure to pardon sinners, the Lord was pleased to bruise his Son; and also with his Son for voluntarily enduring the necessary sufferings: and also, that in exact proportion as the Lord was pleased with these things, he was displeased with something else, on account of which these sufferings were inflicted, and endured; and what could this be but sin, which, without these sufferings, could not possibly be remitted; for he said, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" and, "his blood was shed for the remission of the sins of many."

Now, certainly, in exact proportion as any just, good, and wise being inflicts sufferings for the removal of any evil; and also in exact proportion to the dignity and loveliness of the person who voluntarily submits to endure them; in the very same proportion must be his abhorrence of the evil to be thus removed. If, then, according to this infallible rule of judging, we form our estimate of the heinous nature, and dreadful consequences of sin, how enormous will the amount be!

In pages 38, 39, our author concedes that "any being who has a right to make a penal law, must be supposed to have a right to remit its penalty, in whole or in part, whenever he sees reason for so doing; and on such conditions as, in his opinion, will have the most salutary influence." Grant this just concession, and it will amply justify the divine procedure in the mediation of Jesus Christ, as above stated; but he immediately recedes from his concession, by refusing to admit that "any being in the universe can be properly said to have a right to transfer a just punishment from the guilty to the innocent." Now what saith the Prophet? "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all. For he has made him a sin offering for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the justified of God by him. Isaiah liii. 6. 2 Corinthians v. 21. He made him who knew no sin a sin offering for us; the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all. How did he do this? Was it by making him actually guilty of all our iniquities, or by treating him as it he had been so, by inflicting upon him the wages of sin; namely, sufferings and death—the just wages of sin? that being justified by faith in his blood, we might by saved from wrath through him? Rom. iii. 25. & v. 9.

In his Appendix, p. 233, he asks, "Where shall we find a *requirement* to believe that God laid on his Son the punishment due to us all?" I answer, In the 53d chapter of Isaiah, quoted above. He laid on him the iniquity, that is the punishment due to the iniquity of us all. He further asks, "Or where shall we find a *promise* that those shall be saved who rely on a vicarious punishment for the remission of their sins? I answer, in the above citations, Rom. iii. 25, 26. & v. 9. "Being justified by his blood, (that is, by faith in his blood,) we *shall be saved* from wrath through him." "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. i. 7.

In page 240 he alleges that "Christ has wholly omitted to teach any such doctrine, as a ground of justification, or as an evidence of discipleship." If so, what does our Lord mean, when he says, John vi. 51—58, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." Are not these the happy effects of faith in his death, which he endured for our redemption? And does he not teach this doctrine as a ground, not only of justification, but also of eternal life?

As for the terms *vicar* and *substitute*, against which our author excepts, when applied to Christ, I have only to observe, that he either suffered deservedly on his own account, or on the account of others, to redeem them from suffering: for he assures us himself, that he ought to have suffered as he did. [See Luke xxiv. 26.] Now certainly his sufferings actually redeeming those for whom he suffered, and without which they must have suffered forever, may, with respect to them, be justly called vicarious, or substitutionary; but this is actually the case with respect to all those who are, or shall be, saved from their sins; for without the shedding of his blood there is no remission. See the proof above cited.

Upon the whole, according to the views and reasonings of this author, all sacrificial blood has been shed in vain; for he ascribes to the sacrifice of Christ only a moral influence upon the remission of sin; that is, by its effect upon the mind, producing repentance and love; which he also declares to be the righteousness which God requires for the remission of sins. See p. 147 and 152. The righteousness of God;—the righteousness of faith, pages 63 to 65. Now if these things be so, what need of the sacrifice of Christ; for good men before the coming of Christ, as well as since, possessed this righteousness; and, of course, were justified independent of the moral influence of his example, either in his life or in his death; and surely, if they could and did attain to righteousness, independent of the living and dying example of the Saviour, they might have done so independent of the death of brute animals; for as far as symbolical purification might be conducive to moral purity, or be emblematical of its importance, the purifying stream was a better symbol than blood.

——When I undertook to address you upon N. W's views of the atonement, I thought I should be able to expose and refute his princi-

pal and dangerous misrepresentations in the sheet I had intended for that purpose; but I find that, notwithstanding my studied brevity, there are two or three other topics that ought to have been noticed, viz. the proper and primary intention of sacrifice, and of faith, in the remedial economy; and how these, in the administration, tend to affect the character both of God and man.

According to the revelation with which we are favored, the attributes of the divine character most gloriously displayed in the creation and sustentation of the universe, are power, wisdom, and goodness. Goodness is the universal motto—"very good" the superscription of all his works. Gen. i. 31. Next in his legislation and government we have a glorious display of his justice, truth, and holiness; and lastly, in the redemption and reconciliation of human rebels, we have a transcendant display of the divine love, mercy, and condescension. Upon this glorious display of the divine character, I intend not, now, to insist; but only it must not be tarnished in our salvation. For this all-important purpose has God now, under the gospel, "set forth his Son for a propitiatory sacrifice, or mercy seat, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, to declare at this time his righteousness, that *he might be just* and *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus. Rom. iii. 21—26. Now as all the typical sacrifices were predictions and prefigurations of this, we see in it the proper and primary import of them all; namely, the vindication of the divine justice in justifying him that believeth in Jesus; by clearly and fully evincing that he did so upon just principles. But it is asked, How does this appear? I answer, "Through the redemption that is by Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 24. It is this that justifies the divine procedure, in justifying the ungodly who believes in Jesus: that is, in acquitting him from his obligation to suffer, on account of the sufferings which Christ endured for his sake, by the divine will and appointment. John x. 18. with Heb. x. 10. 5. Now, this being the case, it becomes a righteous thing for God to justify those for whose justification Christ died according to his will. Nor has God slighted his law, or invalidated its authority by this procedure, as he would have done by letting sin pass with impunity; he has rather magnified his law and made it honorable by the obedience of his Son, and his endurance of its penalty in behalf of his people. See Gal. iii. 13, 14. iv. 5, 6.

If, however, our author's allegation against a right to transfer a just punishment from the guilty to the innocent, and, of course, against all substituted sufferings, be correct, then, not only the above quoted scriptures, but all others that ascribe salvation from justly deserved punishment, to the deep humiliation and terrible sufferings of the Saviour, are preposterous and unjust. Did not Christ do and suffer all that the scriptures assert? Was he perfectly innocent? Did he do and suffer these things for the guilty that they might escape condign punishment? And had his doings and sufferings the desired effect? These questions must be answered in the affirmative, or we contradict almost every thing that is written concerning Christ and his salvation;

and if they be thus answered, all the objections and arguments that have been brought against the vicarious and substituted sufferings of the Saviour, fall to the ground. Still, however, not only the justice of such a procedure is called in question, but it is also branded with the epithets of cruelty, of revenge, of an unmerciful, vindictive disposition; and the disposition and conduct of the Son in the article of his sufferings, is, upon the above supposition, contrasted with, and greatly extolled above, that of his heavenly Father. See page 208.

But, after all his declamation against this view of the subject, has our author attempted to clear the Father of a designing and efficient agency in the sufferings of Christ? Confessedly he has not. Indeed, how could he, with any semblance of respect for the divine testimony? Seeing it is expressly declared that "it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he has put him to grief; he has laid on him the iniquity of us all; he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to the death for us all." Accordingly the Son, upon his trial before Pilate, explicitly ascribes his sufferings to the Father; as he had before implicitly done in his prayer in the garden; saying, "O, my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not *my* will, but *thine* be done;" for when Pilate said to him, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and power to release thee," he replied, "Thou couldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above." Wherefore, during the whole of his trial he seeks no favor, he never attempts to procure any indulgence, or to excite the sympathies either of the populace or of his judges; thus practically refusing to acknowledge, or to have any thing to do with, any inflicting or mitigating agency in his sufferings, but that of his heavenly Father, either first or last. In prospect of his sufferings he first addresses *him* in the garden;—at the close of them, he last addresses *him* upon the cross. Hence it is evident that he considers his heavenly Father, first and last, as the sole author of all his sufferings; as does likewise his Apostles afterwards. See Acts ii. 23. & iii. 18. & xiii. 27. with Rom. viii. 32. &c. The Jews and Romans were but the executioners. See Acts iv. 27. 28.

Now as the proper and primary intention of animal sacrifices for the remission of sins, (for "without the shedding of blood there is no remission,") was to manifest and inculcate the heinous nature and deadly effects of sin, and that God would actually pardon the sins of the guilty on account of the sufferings of the innocent; and as no sufferings were of any account for that purpose but the sufferings of Christ, on account of the dignity of his person; he therefore suffered for our sins that he might redeem us from this present evil world, according to the will of God our Father. Gal. i. 4. And *now* God has set him forth for a mercy seat, that we might have access to his mercy, through faith in his blood; to declare his righteousness; that he might be *just*, and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus. But, according to our author, justice has no concern with our salvation. Yet, were I to philosophize, I would say with Young,

"A God all mercy is a God unjust."

But he has declared himself a "just God and a Saviour." And that *he might be so*, the Apostle informs us that he has appointed faith in the blood of his Son for our justifying righteousness. (see Rom. iii. 25, 26.) to the utter exclusion of all boasting, (ver. 27,) and therefore opposed to, and contradistinguished from, all works. Rom iv. 4, 5. And this not only for the glory of the divine justice, but also for the security of the believers—"that the promise might be sure to all the seed." (verse 16.) Now this faith, or reliance on the blood of Christ, for a full and final acquittal from all the penal effects of sin, puts the believer into the actual enjoyment of all the blissful privileges specified in the 5th chapter, from the 1st to the end of the 11th verse. See Rom. v. 1—11. And also glorifies not only the love, mercy, and condescension of God, so transcendantly manifested in the gift of his Son for our salvation; but his justice also, in inflicting the punishment due to the sinner upon the surety, the substitute which his love had provided for that purpose. John iii. 16. with Heb. vii. 22, &c. By the inflicting of which he has most strikingly manifested the just demerit of sin, and of course, the justness of the punishment awarded to the sinner; and lastly, his own rectoral justice, in not suffering an evil so horribly ruinous to pass with impunity in his dominions: and, consequently, to prevent forever, as far as possible, the commission of this horrid evil, at least with any possible hope of impunity.

Thus God has manifested the most harmonious and perfect consistency between the natural and remedial institutions; he has shown them to be equally the effects of wisdom and goodness—equally planned and executed in justice, truth, and holiness; that is, that the love, mercy, and condescension of the latter, perfectly harmonizes with, and actually sustains the justice, truth, and holiness of the former: so that instead of making void the law through faith, it really establishes the law. And as for the righteousness of the divine appointment of the Son to be a substitute and surety, how can we reasonably call it in question? Had not the Father a right to dispose of his Son, with his own consent, just as he pleased? And had not the Son a right to do the will of his Father?

To conclude, if we could be saved in a way honorable to God, without the sacrifice of his Son as a sin offering, we certainly could have been saved without his peculiar doctrines and example, and consequently without his birth, life, or death. I think, upon a candid and impartial view of all the premises, reasonings, and conclusions of this author, the manifestation and death of the Son of God were wholly in vain and unnecessary. But believing, as I do, that it was not possible that any one of our race could be saved without the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, I must hold every attempt to explain it away into a mere moral example, or a display of love, without regard to justice, as tending to subvert the basis of the divine government, and to rob the gospel of all that glorifies the wisdom and power, the justice and mercy of God in putting away sin and in saving the sinner. That the author did not intend this, is to me no apology for the tendency of his work, while it allows me to regard him as having simply mistaken

the true intention of the mission of the Son of God. These reflections are tendered, I trust, in the spirit of all good will to the author, and in sincere affection for yourself as a brother beloved for the hope's sake, which is laid up for us in heaven.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

Reformation exalts and dignifies Human Nature.

MR. GRIMKE'S address on the influence of THE REFORMATION, on Science, and Literature, most eloquently sets forth the influence of personal reformation, in giving compass and elevation to the human mind. A Christian is always, and in all places, all things else being equal, superior to any other man. Let any two persons of the same genius, taste, and literary education, be brought into comparison, the one a Christian, and the other any thing else; and we hazard nothing in affirming that the Christian will always be found superior to the other. Every advance towards the pure Christianity of the Bible, advances man in every thing which dignifies him. Hence the advances in science, literature, and the arts, subsequent to the Protestant Reformation. The knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ communicates a strength and an activity to the mind which no other knowledge can impart. To the truth of this proposition a cloud of witnesses bears testimony, like whom the annals of the world afford no example. The reflex light of Christianity alone has done all that Mr. Grimke narrates; what, then, would be the attainments and the lustre of human genius and human character, were the nations of the earth under the full influence of its direct rays?

EDITOR.

"The moderns, to say nothing more, have shown themselves, not at all inferior to antiquity, in power and originality, in variety and felicity of talent. Indeed, Newton and Leibnitz, Locke, Butler and Bacon, Chatham and Burke, Milton and Shakspeare, Linnæus, Buffon and Davoisier, are unequalled by any of the ancients. Grant that Hume, Robertson and Gibbon, are *not the rivals in style* of Thucydides and Herodotus, of Livy and Sallust, and that they are not, is due to the *language* and not to the *author; yet those are every way superior to these, in all that constitutes the highest value of history.* Bossuet, Bourdaloue and Massillon, Pitt, Sheridan, Fox, Erskine and Canning, fear no comparison, if liberal and candid, with Demosthenes, Pericles, Isocrates and Cicero. Schlegal has ranked Shakspeare above all the dramatists of antiquity; while the critical judgment and accomplished taste of the Edinburgh Review, has styled Milton, "the first of poets." To say no more, by way of comparison, though the parallel might be advantageously pursued, let us remark, how much has been done by the moderns, almost wholly within the last three centuries, in Art and Science, without any or scarcely any model, among the ancients. The compass, gunpowder, paper, printing, engraving,

and oil painting; the whole department of navigation, including ship building; the system of modern tactics by land and sea, of modern commerce, political economy and banking; algebra, fluxions, and the sublime works of Newton and La Place; anatomy and surgery; chemistry, electricity, magnetism and botany; the telescope and microscope; the time-piece, the air-pump, the steam-engine and galvanism; the true theory and practice of government; the division and subordination of power; the principles of evidence and trial; diplomacy, the balance of power and the law of nations; the history of man, of arts and sciences, and of literature; philology and the philosophy of history; and lastly, a nobler and better scheme of morals, and a profound, rational and comprehensive theology—all these and numberless other inventions, discoveries, and improvements, are the work of the modern world. *Whenever that world shall judge boldly, independently, candidly, liberally, the decision must be in favor of the masters in Literature and Science, who have arisen since the 15th century.* Whether in abstruse and comprehensive, or in refined and elegant speculation; in profound, energetic, logical reasoning; in powerful, commanding, persuasive eloquence; in the intellectual and imaginative poetry, in the descriptive and pathetic; in practical wisdom, moral, international or political, civil, social or domestic; in those arts, which employ, while they improve and bless the people; in a word, in all that makes man industrious and useful, virtuous and happy, and prepares him for the service of God, of his fellow men and of posterity—if, with a view to these things, we contemplate the great men, who have arisen since the year 1500, we must acknowledge them, unrivaled by the ancients. This is my creed, I glory in it: and this, I speak it with triumphant confidence, this, before the close of the 19th century, will be the creed of my country.

"If then the moderns thus rank in a comparison with antiquity, if there never has been, since the Reformation, a deficiency of talents, in any department of Science and Art, of Literature and Knowledge; what reason have we to fear, that the time will ever come, when such a deficiency shall exist? For myself, I cling with the energy and enthusiasm of religion, philanthropy, and patriotism, to the belief, *that such a period shall never exist.* "While the earth remaineth, while seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease," I believe that the human mind shall never again be enslaved; that the Protestant nations shall never again sit in darkness; that the bright career of improvement, begun by the Reformation, shall never terminate; till all the nations shall be gathered into the fold of the one Shepherd, and all sects shall be embosomed, in the holy Sanctuary of the Millennial Church.—Then shall the triumph of the principles of the Reformation be complete. Then shall the Christian religion have become *the only standard of public and private conduct.* Then shall the New Testament have established its dominion every where, substantially and practically, as the only fountain of all rights, international, civil and social, as *the moral constitution of a world of nations.*

"My last remark relates to ourselves. If the expectations of Protestant countries, individually, and above all as a community, be thus bright, what hopes of future excellence in Science and Literature, may not our country reasonably indulge? I answer a more glorious hope than any other people, that ever lived. In the daily progress even "from rise of morn, to set of sun," of popular education, of individual usefulness, of social blessings, of public happiness; in all the materials of national power and aggrandizement; in the prospect of an influence over the fortunes of the world, more wise, more moral, more commanding, than ever state enjoyed; in all that invests a people with the authority and majesty, the beauty and attractiveness of virtue and justice, of wisdom and knowledge; I know that this Union has no rival, among the nations, ancient or modern. And shall not we, in like manner, surpass them, in Science and Literature and Art? We may disparage ourselves, as the timidity of Domenichino, and the humility of Newton undervalued their own genius. Our cotemporaries in the great school for the education of States, instituted by the Reformers, may contemn us, even as the fellow-students of the Italian painter and of the English philosopher, ridiculed and despised them. But the great masters of the school of the Reformers, in our day, in our own, as well as in other countries, already anticipate for these United States, a destiny more glorious and happy, than the world has ever witnessed. And well may they predict such fortunes for America, when, besides all that constitutes us the first of free, educated, Christian, peaceful States, we enjoy advantages, even in relation to Science, Literature and Art, such as no other people ever possessed. We have laid the foundations of improvement in all knowledge, broader and deeper, than ever people did. In all other nations, these have been the result of accident and violence, of singular and often fortuitous occurrences; but, with us, they are the fruits of system in choice, and concentration in effort. In other nations, the monarch, the statesman, the philosopher, the patron, has labored almost single-handed; but with us, the People have arisen as one Man, to lay these foundations, in the fear of God, and in the presence of the world. Besides the privilege, that we commenced even our colonial existence, with the principles of the Reformers, and that they have grown with our growth, and strengthened with our strength, we enjoy a further advantage, consequent on the triumph of the Reformation. The whole body of British Literature, more profound in Science, more sublime in Genius, and more accomplished in Taste: more substantial, useful, rational and various than that, which any other people has ever produced, constitutes the basis of our structure. And, as the scholars of the British Isles have built on the foundations of Classic antiquity, an edifice more perfect in majesty and loveliness, than the fairy temple of Greece, so, shall our America raise, on the foundations of English Literature, a structure more admirable in "the sublime, the wonderful, the fair," than poet's fancy has ever imaged forth.

"*In every department of knowledge, whether theoretical or practical, where* THINKING AND REASONING *are the means and criterion of excel*

lence, our country must, IF THERE BE TRUTH AND POWER IN THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION, *surpass every people that ever existed.* I fear not the great names of Archimedes, Aristotle, and Plato, of Demosthenes and Cicero, of Tacitus and Thucydides. I know that we must excel them. I fear not the greater names of Bacon and Newton, of Locke, Butler, Hume and Robertson, of Chatham, Burke and Pitt. I know that we must excel them also. The landmarks of human excellence seemed to have been set, as for an eternal state of Man, when Archimedes, Aristotle and Plato, Thucydides and Demosthenes constructed the noble edifice of ancient history, philosophy and eloquence. But greater men than these have arisen, and built anew the Holy City of knowledge, placing its foundations amidst a better state of society, on the double bases of the Classic and Christian systems. We have appeared in our turn, and the structures of former ages, and of other nations, have become the basis of ours. Instead, therefore, of despairing, let us feel the strongest assurance, that the present day is to our people, as it were *but the primary school of education* and that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of Man to conceive" the honors, in Science and Literature, reserved for us. I know that hundreds, perhaps thousands, will regard these sentiments, as visionary in thought, and enthusiastic in feeling. But I would not exchange such delightful anticipations of my country's glory, for the timidity of the awe-stricken worshiper, either of Antiquity, or of that European Literature, whose laurels spring from the very principles, which we are cultivating, with more energy, assiduity and ardor than all other nations.

"Why did Grecian surpass Roman Literature, in all the constituent excellencies of originality, energy and richness, of sublimity, beauty, and variety? To what causes shall we ascribe this superiority, but to THE FREEDOM AND POWER OF THOUGHT? And whence did these arise, but from the popular institutions of Greece, from the mutual action and re-action, the national pride, and emulation, which influenced individuals and the sister States of the same political neighborhood? And do we not see, moreover, that the Literature of Greece was the child of her prime, whilst power, and glory, and liberty flourished. But the Augustan age of Rome was the offspring of her declining years, when the republic had perished, in form as well as in soul? Why did Italy excel Spain, in the same characteristics of literary merit? Why is there a force, a beauty, a variety, an originality of genius in the Fine Arts and in Poetry, in Philosophy and History, which are unrivaled by the Spaniards, eminent as they are? Do we not trace the efficient causes in the spirit, which once animated Venice and Genoa, Rome and Florence, and many of the small principalities in the North of Italy? Do we not discover them in the national pride and emulation of independent princes; in the comparative freedom, activity, boldness and enterprize, which marked the Italian people, at the jubilee of their literary glory? Why have the writers of Germany been superior to their gay and gallant neighbors of La Belle France, in the philosophical spirit, in the inventions of original

thinking, though not in the graces of the artist; in the profound investigation of principles, though not in the critical application of rules; in various, solid, and valuable learning; in the energy and enthusiasm with which they have studied Man, whether as the subject of Religion or the end of civil society; whether as the object of philosophy, history or poetry? Shall we not assign as adequate causes, that the German States were the Patriarchal family of the Reformation; that the manner and habit, the love and obligation of intense study, and sound erudition, have been the common inheritance of their Universities: And that the character of their state of society, and political arrangements, has imparted more of nature, energy and individuality, and, if I may venture the expression, more of romantic and picturesque beauty to their Literature! Why, indeed, have the Protestants of Germany left far behind them, in the Olympic Games of Science and Art, their brethren of the same national household, if it be not, that causes of peculiar force, of flexible and diversified character, have exerted a commanding influence over the fortunes of the one, but have left untouched the destinies of the other? Why has Catholic France excelled Catholic Spain, in genius and taste, in literature and knowledge, in philosophy and history, in the theory and practice both of Arts and Sciences? Was it not chiefly, because the power and intelligence, the learning and enterprize of the Protestant party, though they had failed to reform France either in Church or in State, yet contributed pre-eminently to that warfare of minds and feelings, of thinking and reasoning, of opinions and sentiments, *which made her* EMPHATICALLY PROTESTANT IN SCIENCE AND LITERATURE?

"Why, in fine, have the British Isles excelled the North and the South, the Middle and the West of Europe, in depth, comprehensiveness, and power of thought; in political Science, both practical and speculative; in all that regards the best interests of Man, as to religion, society and government; in the knowledge of human nature, individual and social; in the intellectual and imaginative sublime, whether of philosophy, eloquence or poetry; in a profound moral sympathy with the visible and invisible world; and in a beauty and pathos, which invest the writings of the Orator, Novelist and Poet, with an air of peculiar majesty, richness, simplicity and taste? What cause shall we assign for these phenomena, *but the power of study, the freedom of thought, and the liberty that lives and moves in their institutions?* And why, did British Literature, during the reign of the third George, ascend the heights of fame, with a step, so bold and free; with an air of such elegance, dignity, and grace? Why did her authors so pre-eminently excel in originality and variety: in reasoning, eloquence, and the knowledge of principles, theoretical and practical; in the power of thought, comprehensive, profound and acute; in sublimity and beauty; in pathos, splendor, and richness? Shall we not recognize, in our day, the mysterious agency, the uncontrollable working of causes, analogous to those, which created the gigantic literature of the age of Elizabeth? The Reformation was the well-spring of thought and principles, at that period. Our Revolution of '76, is the fountain of living waters now.———

The age of the American Revolution is to the *rights* of Man, what the age of the Reformers was to his *duties*. This, republished the true principles of Christian liberty, obligation of happiness—that of natural right, of political and civil freedom. The Reformation of Luther laid the foundation *of the rights of Man in Society*. The Revolution of 1776 finished the superstructure of *Religious Liberty*.—The principles of the Protestant epoch remodeled the Church—those of the American æra—Society and Government. Daughters of the same divine parent, the Religion of the Bible, they have founded a new family among the nations. Whilst all Europe trembled, as with an earthquake, amidst the convulsions of the thirty years' war, the foundations of this new family were laid at Jamestown and Plymouth.—Here, on these Western shores, savage and inhospitable, the infant state was born, unnoticed and unknown, like the child in Revelations, that was hidden in the wilderness. Many a wild torrent of Indian massacre swept over our childhood; and left behind it the desolate pathway of the whirlwind. Many a mountain wave from the battle-fields of Europe rushed across the Atlantic; and garments rolled in blood were the portion of our youth. As the prime of life approached, the children of the outcast and wanderer arose, and fought on their own soil, by the side, and in the cause of the parent nation. The prime of life came, and the principles of the Reformation taught them that Independence was *a right and a duty*, when civil and political liberty was invaded. The Gordian knot of colonial obedience was severed: a fierce struggle for the mastery ensued: and it pleased the Almighty, that the victory should be ours. That victory was a consequence, however remote—a triumph, however unlooked for, of the Reformation.

"The spirit of inquiry, first principles, thinking, reasoning, were the very essence, the genius of the Reformation, in the age of Luther. The same were the essence, the genius of the Revolution under Washington. The Protestant nations have surpassed all the rest of the European family in the depth and comprehensiveness, in the sublimity and beauty, in the richness and variety of their Literature and Science. Britain, the guardian angel of the liberty of Europe, the vanguard of civilization and freedom in the Old World,—

> "She, in the soul of Man, her better wealth,
> "The richest: Nature's noblest produce, she
> "The immortal mind in perfect height and strength,
> "Bears with a prodigal opulence."

And we, the only offspring nation ever bore, worthy of such an ancestry, we must not, we cannot, we shall not rest satisfied, with inferiority to English fame, in Science and Literature. The spirit of inquiry, first principles, thought, reasoning, these are the causes, which, under circumstances singularly felicitous, have made her in power and glory, in wisdom and virtue, in wealth, happiness, freedom and knowledge, the greatest European State whether ancient or modern. And the same causes shall enable us, still more fortunate in situation, at our appointed day of meridian excellence, to ascend a loftier height of

power and glory, of wisdom and virtue, of wealth, happiness, freedom and knowledge, than England has ever attained. She has accomplished all, that a European people, subjects of a limited monarchy, can attain, under the transforming, regenerating influence of the Reformation. She is the Rome of the Modern World, but has far excelled the Republic of Antiquity. We shall accomplish still more, in effecting all, that an American people, citizens of a confederacy of Republics can perform, under the combined influence of the Reformation and of our Revolution. We shall be the Greece of the Modern World, unrivaled by the Literature of three thousand years. All, indeed that the system of the Reformers can bring to pass, our country, the only holy land of Religious liberty, the only promised land of political freedom, shall assuredly accomplish. Then shall OUR COUNTRY be—emphatically, pre-eminently—THE EMPIRE OF MIND, THE REPUBLIC OF LETTERS.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'CORKLE,—*a Layman.*

(*Continued.*)

THE dissolution of the present administration, and the great events connected with it, is a subject of the highest importance, and all the evidence for or against should be duly weighed. I can have no interest in believing or propagating error. If the opinions respecting the dissolution of the church be erroneous, the error cannot be fatal in its consequence—cannot have a demoralizing effect. Nothing can be lost by investigation—much may be gained. If the fact should prove that the present church, the dispensation committed to the Gentiles, is to close, is to be laid aside, rolled together as a scroll, how fatal is the mistake to be! If we be found clinging to our traditions, instead of searching the Scripture; if we be found adhering to our names and creeds, making or supporting the divisions in the fold of Christ, how can we escape the fate of former dispensations—how expect the plaudit of the Judge? How stand before the Master when he calls the servants to a reckoning. When arraigned before his tribunal will we defend ourselves, our names, our creeds, our favorite *isms*, and tell him to his face that those divisions are necessary—that war and dissension are calculated to stimulate to action, productive of investigation; that party spirit and conflicting interests make men vigilant, more industrious than better motives—such as love to God and good will to man! Such a tribunal, I verily believe, is soon to be erected—such a reckoning soon to take place, and the servants all sunk in deep sleep! And in spite of the signs of the times, in spite of the

omens of his coming, in spite of two dispensations which have fallen by the stroke of Omnipotence, all admonishing us of our fate—in spite of his threatenings, his uplifted hand, his unchanging word, his former dealings with corruption; yet will the churches cling to their traditions—their corruption; and wake up from their delirium and fatal dreaming when it is too late to escape being engulphed in remediless ruin, amidst the wreck of human institutions, human usurpation, and tyranny, the casting down of thrones, and the fall of empires and dominions. Now, are these things mere chimeras of the brain, phantoms of imagination? Reader, I pray you examine the ground on which you are standing. How near akin are the churches to the Babylon long doomed to interminable destruction—positively they are daughters. Ordination and authority have come down by succession from this Mother of Harlots. Can authority rise higher than the fountain? Can Antichrist confer Christian authority? What is meant by the term *harlots?* mother and daughters both implied—harlots in the plural number—many. What church can plead exemption from the charge? Have all nations "drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication," and can they escape drinking in the same degree, the cup of vengeance she is soon to drink? Is Babylon to fall, and those who have drunk of her wine to remain unhurt? Is there no meaning in these things? Babylon is not to fall alone: the cities of the nations are to fall. What is meant by these *cities of the nations* in the plural? No one examining? No, we are listening to the sing-song of the day, the lullabies of our dry morose divines, who are telling us a thousand things which need not be told—a thousand tales, fables, lies—telling us that the "church is to come up out of the wilderness, leaning on her beloved." Now there is not a warrant for this in all God's word! The church is never to come up out of the wilderness. I challenge the text, the solitary text, to the contrary. It is one of the wretched blunders of our teachers, and palmed on the world as Bible!

The woman in the Apocalypse, clothed with the sun, must be a figure of the church, or she is a figure of nothing in the visible or invisible world—an *ignis fatuus.* Now can any one show from the sacred oracles that this woman ever came up out of the wilderness? She was nourished there twelve hundred and sixty days, or years; but not the most distant intimation of her return; and yet we are dreaming of her coming up out of the wilderness! The world is in tiptoe expectation of a day, rich with prosperity, when the church is to put on her beautiful garments, glowing in renovated strength, and converts, numerous as the drops of the mornings. These things are hoped, are preached, are believed, when in their stead we are to have *war, pestilence,* and *fire.*

Our leaders would perform miracles without the aid of miracles; would renovate an old self-righteous church; make old things new. What a contrast between the present and the primitive church! Corruption knows no retrograde flow; dispensations are never reorganized; a lost step is never regained; the voice of nature, every thing we see around us, but the elements, is teaching the self-evident doc-

trine of decay; and the history of man, from the beginning of time, is on our side of this question. How small a part of christendom deserve the name—how small a part of that minority are following the "still small voice" of the gospel—peace and good will to man!

A belief of these opinions cannot produce inactivity. The present dispensation is in force while it lasts. He who does nothing for the Master cannot expect the plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servant." No time for relaxation. A general reformation is necessary. This I despair of seeing. A few may be plucked from the falling house, the impending ruin, ere the four winds be let loose to "hurt the earth."

If the church is never to come up out of the wilderness, what is to become of her? What is to consummate the figure of the bride, the Lamb's wife? The woman clothed with the sun, and the bride, the Lamb's wife, are as different as Mary and Elizabeth. The one fled into the wilderness—the other is to come down from God out of heaven—"the great city, the holy Jerusalem." Among the many blunders of the day this is not the least, that this holy Jerusalem is transferred to the world! And from the pulpit (the fountain head of error) we are often admonished that we "are going home to the New Jerusalem;" and instead of this, the New Jerusalem is coming down to us!—is to descend "out of heaven from God!"

Now if there is any dependence to be placed on John's Patmos visions, events of the greatest magnitude are pending—events such as the world has never witnessed. I can scarcely persuade myself that a certain class of men whom I could name, do really believe John in the Revelations. If they do, it is hard to determine which is most blameworthy—their ignorance and indifference respecting those things predicted by the Apostle, or rank deism. If this New Jerusalem be a figure, what may we expect when it is realized?

But the world is so much absorbed about converting the Hindoos, incorporating churches, with a thousand religious institutions, that the great matters which the eternal Jehovah, with his shining myriads, is to superintend, is soon to bring upon the stage, is pushed out of view—is lost sight of in the hot chase and endless cry after some ghostly phantom, or religious speculation. This amazing superstructure, this New Jerusalem, be it what it may, is to descend "from God out of heaven," with a grandeur, a blaze of glory never before seen on earth; yet this city, this gift of God, all garnished by the hand of Omnipotence, embellished by the Architect of the Universe, lucid as light, and radiant as the bow of Jehovah, is lost sight of, forgotten, amidst the mighty scramble about creeds, territory, or gold.

It is worth a man's head, at least his reputation must suffer, if he call our priests *sceptics* now-a-days; but, in the name of the Lord, what are they? Do they believe Moses and the Prophets? Do they believe the testimony of Christ by his Apostle John? Do they believe that this "holy Jerusalem is to descend out of heaven from God?" But they have learned to spiritualize every thing, but the divinity of gold. And this Jerusalem, notwithstanding its *descent*, and the glory

of the nations coming into it, is to be consummated in the worlds above! Happy way of ridding us of every thing contrary to our traditions or wishes! And this spiritual legerdemain can alter or change almost any part of the sacred oracles. The resurrection of the martyrs has long ago undergone its potent operation, and converted it into a ghost—*to wit:* the spirit of the martyrs resurrected. But this will prove too much; it will prove that the spirit of the martyrs is not in the land of the living; and farther, a spirit is not a proper subject of resurrection.

Now the "holy Jerusalem" must be a figure, a metaphor; for the present church, in its primitive state, was called "a holy city." If it be a figure of a church which is to descend "out of heaven from God," then, and in that case, what is to become of the present? This very New Jerusalem substantiates the foregoing opinions—a new witness establishing our former views—the close of the present, and the introduction of a new dispensation.

The resurrection of the martyrs (I give it as an opinion) is to consummate the figure proposed to us in the descent of the New Jerusalem—is to be the memorable day from which the universal reign of Christ is to be dated; and the very design of their resurrection is given: "They shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." What need of priests in the worlds above?——The passage respecting the resurrection of the martyrs, makes complete sense in all its points and bearings. It may be said that the resurrection of the witnesses is uniformly taken as a metaphor, and why not the other? The witnesses cannot be taken in any other sense. Who are they? What are they? The world is much divided about the witnesses. No one has seen them. —They can have no positive identification. But it is not so with the martyrs: their lives are recorded—their history is written in blood, which will descend down to posterity while time endures. They were buried, at least some of them; the bones of others are scattered to the four winds; and those that can be had compose a profitable traffic throughout a large part of christendom. They lived, they suffered, they died—died for the cause of the Master—for the word of God. They can be identified; positively and really men, women, and children; not metaphors, not principles; no figures needed, nor can be applied; and they are proper and legitimate subjects of a resurrection, and it is right that they should be favored thus above other men. If it be the spirit of the martyrs that is to be raised, then the spirit which existed in them must be exanimate. This fact I would almost admit from taking a look at the christian world. Is the spirit which existed in the martyrs different from that which should, and does exist in all christians. It was nothing more than the spirit of Christ, and without the spirit of Christ we are none of his. This will prove too much for the orthodox of the day. What was the spirit, the temper, the character of those who suffered for the cause of Christ? They were meek, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of love and good works; faith, hope, charity. These were manifest in their lives—their whole conduct; fruits of holiness—principles. Are these things

to be remanded back from the abodes of death, and thus to become "priests of God and of Christ"? What! principles to become agents! God has twice committed his heritage to men in the flesh, and twice have they turned it into a den of thieves; therefore, will the management of the next administration be committed to hands which will not err—those whom gold cannot lure, nor temptation lead astray.

If this resurrection be a figure of christianity being renovated, a restoration of primitive rectitude, there will be a new thing under the sun; and God will not deal with this dispensation as he has formerly done, and he, to speak with reverence, has changed his plans of dealing with vice—has discovered that some other expedient beside vengeance will check the mighty tide of iniquity; that an old church may be patched up and mended until it becomes new, vigorous, and sound again; that an old garment, worn and threadbare, may be mended, made comely, or sound by a piece of new cloth! That when moral operations have become ineffectual, light and motive impotent, he on physical principles can renovate christianity in his own time and way; that the spirit, *to wit*—the holiness, the devotion, the invincible zeal of the martyrs, is to be resurrected; and this is to be done on physical principles, (the moral having become ineffectual,) for resurrections are entirely to be performed upon physical principles. If the resurrection before us be a metaphor, what is the meaning of this passage in Dan. xii. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." "Many of them," this positively implies a part, and strengthens John's partial resurrection. Nor can the passage apply to the final judgment, for it is to be a time of trouble, a time when Michael shall stand up, "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people."

This prediction is evidently relative to the Jewish nation; and most of the judicious look for a restoration of the Jews. The Jews are miraculously preserved, a separate people, firm in the hope of a return to their land. Eighteen hundred years of adversity cannot conquer this hope—a hope that never wanes with the changes and fluctuations of time. Nothing can break the charm which binds them to their land, their laws, or their religion. Arguments in favor of christianity for eighteen hundred years, have left them just where they were found—as unconquerable as the laws of nature. Nothing short of the most stupendous miracle, one which they all must see, will convert them to christianity; and who can look for this in favor of a religion as badly abused, as mortally corrupted as that of the Jews'. One ground of reciprocal meeting between Jew and Gentile, where they can embrace, will be found where neither party are occupants, which neither can claim. On what other ground can divided intolerant christianity meet? A miracle is necessary—aye, indispensable; an event which will hush the din of war, and put to silence the endless clang of contending parties, amalgamate Jew and Gentile, and break down the insuperable bars between those who profess the same religion. And just such a miracle does the Bible warrant us to expect—the descent of the New Jerusalem and the resurrection of those who were "beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the word of God,"

with other events and circumstances, which will rid the world of sceptical Christians and unbelieving Jews. If there was a partial resurrection at the introduction of Christianity, is it unreasonable to expect such an event at the introduction of Christ's universal reign?

There are objections of this kind made:—The martyrs, say they, are in Paradise, in perfect enjoyment. Are they to become citizens of earth again? I would thus answer the objection:—Can a celestial or an immortalized being be out of heaven in all the universe of God? But another objection is this:—Are they to engage in new toils, as they are to become priests, &c.? Can immortality become weary? Is there an intelligent being in the universe unemployed? No being can be inactive and answer the design of creation. I presume there is nothing but energy and activity from the great First Cause down to the lowest grade of intelligences—yes, down to the smallest insect in creation. Activity is the very spice of life, the very soul of enjoyment. Is heaven to consist in nothing else but repose and repast? Recumbent virtue is not virtue. I'll vouch for it, there is not a sofa or a dream in all the Paradise of God.

But how are they to become companions of men in the flesh? They can be arbiters, overseers, sit in judgment. "I saw thrones, (in the plural) and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them." Rev. xx.

It is objected farther, that we could not bear communications with glorified beings. Holiness has nothing to fear; 'tis guilt that makes cowards. Christ was seen after his resurrection without fear. Daniel saw Gabriel without terror. "Fear not ye," was sufficient to allay the fears of timid women, who came early to the sepulchre. And farther, the most pious, holy, devotional men on earth would bear with the least terror an interview with celestial beings.

If there was none other scripture to support the doctrine of the resurrection of the martyrs, there might be some pretext for turning this 20th Rev. into a metaphor. But the happy art of spiritualizing can answer or do away any argument, or change the first and simple meaning of any part of the sacred oracles.

Alas! what precept, prophecy, or ordinance within the lids of the Bible, is not perverted or called into question by those professing the Christian religion! And yet this multiform hundred headed hydra is to be renovated by some strange metamorphosis to become the bride, the Lamb's wife. I speak in general terms of christendom, not of the Christian religion. The religion of Christ will stand while the administration and the administrators, abuses and abusers will be wrapt in a conflagration destined by them for the material world. Far be it from me to say that the precepts of the gospel are to be changed or laid aside in the wreck of the administration; its precepts, many of them, are as unchangeable as the throne of Omnipotence. Many precepts were brought out of the Jewish into the Christian dispensation, and will continue in force while there is a Lawgiver in the universe, or an intelligent being in his mighty empire.

I would draw another argument in favor of the resurrection of the martyrs, from Paul to the Philippians, iii. 10. "If by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead." This text applied to the resurrection in the common acceptation, is one of the most incomprehensible texts in the sacred oracles. It plainly implies that the resurrection is attainable, suspended upon some contingency, or the performance of some duty, which may be attained or may be lost. Paul plainly acknowledges that he had not "attained." If Paul was not a proper subject of resurrection when writing, who may hope to survive the tomb? None; no, not one. Paul must have had the resurrection of the martyrs in view, or he is "hard to be understood." The Apostle, a little before this time, had been "caught away to the third heaven." This place is quite as hard to understand as the former, without we apply it to dispensations—the difficulty is immediately solved. A third dispensation is probably the very meaning of the writer, in which those who should be slain for the word of God would be raised to reign with the Master a thousand years. This was a new stimulus to Paul—caused him to "press forward." The doctrine was believed in the first ages of Christianity, and caused many to act imprudently, and no doubt brought this truth into disrepute. "Third heaven," in the common acceptation, would originate some odd conjectures about the locality of these places. Reader, recollect that the word *heaven* often, very often means just God's moral government on earth; and to apply the first heaven to the Jewish dispensation, the second to the present Christian economy rising above the former; the third, Christ's universal reign; Christ reigning the King of kings, offers nothing contrary to reason or scripture, or a succession of great events rising in grandeur and majesty above each other, each affording a new display of the wisdom and glory of the great uncreated Ruler of the universe.*

We have thus dwelt upon the resurrection of the martyrs, because it is an important feature among the unfulfilled predictions, and closely connected with the prophecies, we propose taking up presently.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

An Essay on a Particular Providence.

BY J. A. WATERMAN.

O Lord! I know that it is not in the way of man that walketh, to direct his steps. Jeremiah.

The heart of man deviseth his steps, but the Lord directs his ways. Proverbs.

THERE is no subject which the mind of an intelligent being can contemplate with so much pleasure and profit, as the moral government of the great Jehovah. All who admit the existence of a Supreme Being, admit that he

*We fear that some of the spiritualizers may ask our author a question here on the difference between his exposition of the *third heaven*, and their exposition of the first resurrection. If the third heaven be a third dispensation, why may not the first resurrection be a great revival? He will please explain this in the sequel.——*Ed.*

governs the various orders of beings which his hand has formed. The argument by which we prove the existence of an intelligent *First Cause*, will prove that he governs the world or worlds he has made. Every where in nature we see effects produced which suppose a *designing intelligent Cause*. There also appears to be a *unity* in the design, so that the whole system, so far as we can comprehend it, appears to be the work of one being, one *infinite intelligent mind*. Both in the moral and physical government of the world, we see means adapted to certain ends in the most admirable manner. The design is apparent, the skill exquisite and confounding. Who, for instance, that examines the eye, can doubt for a moment that it was formed for the purpose of vision? How admirable the structure! The same design is manifest in every part of nature. To attribute such a complex system of things, so beautifully and harmoniously arranged, to the power of blind Chance, is folly indeed. "The fool" only "saith in his heart, There is no God."

It is equally unreasonable to suppose that this system of things is unoriginate, or has existed from all eternity. Epicurus and his followers argue most inconclusively when they infer the world to be eternal. Every thing in nature appears to be dependent for its existence on a cause out of itself. I now speak of that which is endowed with animal, rational, or vegetable life. If the life of a vegetable or animal is once destroyed, it remains forever under the dominion of death, unless a foreign power interposes. "To restore it again to life," as Sir Isaac Newton observes, "requires the power of a Creator." Atheists, such as Mirabeau, attribute to Nature this power. But what do they mean by *Nature*, and the *laws of Nature?* These are words which are often used by men who profess to be philosophers. From the manner in which these phrases are used even by some professors of religion, it would seem that they attach some *efficiency* to what they call *a law of Nature*. But have the laws of Nature, abstractly considered, any *efficiency?* Can they produce any thing independent of God's *agency?* It is certain they cannot. "The laws of mechanics," as Dr. Reid observes, "never made a machine." They are nothing but rules by which things are done. The laws of nature are rules by which God does certain things: they suppose a law-maker. In this light they are viewed by the greatest philosophers. Let us hear what the great Sir Isaac Newton says on this subject:—"But I often use the term of *attraction*, impulse towards a centre, or any other word indicating an inclination or tendency, indifferently and promiscuously, or synonymously, and these terms are to be considered not in a *physical*, but in a *mathematical* sense. Whence let the reader be careful not to suppose that by terms of this kind I any where define the *species* or *mode* of action to mean an *actual cause* or *physical efficiency;* or that, in fact, I ascribe physical power to *centres*, which are mathematical points, if perchance I shall say that *centres attract*, or that *centres possess power.*"

It is now, I believe, admitted by the most profound investigators of nature, that there is no necessary connexion between causes and their effects. All we know on this subject is that one thing follows another in regular succession, but no necessary connexion can be shown between that which we call a *cause* and the *effect* we attribute to it. We can only say that things so exist by the will of God; for, says Dr. Abercrombie, "in regard to any two such events, our idea of *causation*, of *power*, amounts to nothing more than our knowledge of the fact, that the one is invariably the antecedent of the other; of the *mysterious agency on which the causation depends we know nothing, and never can know any thing in our present state of being.*" The true philosopher, when he says a thing is done, or brought about by a *law in nature*, means that such is the way in which things are done by God—the law is the rule by which he acts. And this is agreeable to scripture, "for in him we live, and move, and have our being."

The Bible says that all things are upheld by God; and is not this agreeable to reason and philosophy? I know that some philosophers suppose that a certain motion given by God to the system of nature at first, is sufficient to

account for all the motion since that time. This conclusion is founded on the fact that a body once put into motion will continue that motion forever, except it be impeded by another power or obstructing medium. But have we proof that the planets move through an unobstructing medium? The contrary appears to me to be probable; and I am certain that no proof has yet been afforded of the fact that they move through a vacuum. Now if this view of the subject be correct, we conclude that the planets are moved by the power of God; and that as the poet sings,

> ——————"*Should he withdraw*
> *His power, the whole astonish'd universe*
> *Would, reeling to and fro, swift start away,*
> *And chaos come again.*"

To suppose with some others, that nature, or the laws of nature, have power to produce vegetables or animals, and consequently that if all things possessed of animal or vegetable life, were, by some dreadful convulsion of nature, swept away, nature would reproduce them, is contrary to all our experience on this subject, and most unreasonable.

It has always appeared to me that those philosophers and divines who endeavor to exalt revelation by attributing to it our ideas of God, unintentionally injure the cause they attempt to support.* They act as foolish a part as the astronomer, who, under pretence of exalting the power of the telescope, would destroy our eyes. I cannot see how a confirmed Atheist can be converted to a belief in the existence of God by any argument offered by *revelation*. Dr. Chalmers supposes that the historical argument for the truth of Christianity would have more influence upon the mind of an Atheist, than the argument for the existence of God derived from the works of nature. I confess I cannot agree with the Doctor. If the Atheist should apply the same scepticism to historical evidence that he does to the testimony of nature, what influence would the historical argument for Christianity have on his mind? None at all. He would say with Hume, that it is contrary to our experience that men ever rose from the dead, but it is not contrary to our experience that men testify to falsehood. I do not say that this argument of Hume's is a good one; but it is to me more forcible than any objection that has been urged against the argument for the existence of God drawn from the signs of intelligence exhibited in nature. If the Atheist should assume the absurd opinion that all things came by chance, if he should even see a miracle wrought by a professed prophet, it would not convince him of his folly. Surely, he might say, if consistent, if so many men as now exist came by *chance*, this man, who has now returned from the grave, may have come also by chance. If he should say that the world has existed from eternity, and possesses the power in itself of producing men, the sight of a man coming from the grave, or any other miracle, would not convince him of the existence of God. Surely, he might say, this is a new development of nature's power, but not more astonishing than what I have seen a thousand times in the regular productions of nature. Now I do not say that Atheists would always be so consistent. Miracles would, perhaps, surprise them for a moment into their senses, but they must abandon the first principle of Atheism, before they could be converted by a miracle, if they should even see it. Indeed, I know of no way of convincing such men that God made the world, but by giving them the privilege of seeing it done. Should an angel declare it to them, why, according to their principles, should they believe it? They say that men will tell falsehoods, and therefore they will not believe Prophets or Apostles, and surely it is not self-evident that other beings, if there be any, may not also lie. Why should an Atheist believe the testimony of such a transient visitant?† If the scepticism of the Atheist is followed to its final consequences, it is easy to see that a man so foolish as an Atheist cannot be convinced that God made him, because his own creation can never be an object of his senses. Surely we may say in the language of

Heaven, that "such men are fools"—that is, they abuse their reason; for this is the meaning of the term "fool" in Scripture:—yea, they are "the most brutish among the people."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

NOTE A.

IF to ascribe our ideas of God to supernatural revelation be a fault, I must confess guilt; for to this hour, notwithstanding all that natural religionists have said, notwithstanding all that deists, theists, and moral philosophers have affirmed, reasoned, and taught of man's inability to gather from the testimony of his five senses and his powers of ratiocination upon the volume of nature, the existence of one spiritual FirstCause—of one God—I must believe with Paul, that it is "*by faith*," and not by reason, nor by sense, that "we understand the worlds were made by the word of God"—and that "the world by wisdom knew not God."

I am aware, too, that Paul has said, "His invisible attributes, even his eternal power and divinity, since the creation of the world, are very evident, being known by his works." [Rom. i. 19, 20, *new version*, which is more forcible against our views than the common version.] Yet when I listen to the whole testimony of God, and examine the whole powers of man to originate or to have originated in him new ideas, I must cleave to the position—*that not only the name, but the idea of God, is supernatural, and derived from the direct communications of God.*

That every creature is a witness, that all the works or God are witnesses and vouchers of his being and perfections, is not only admitted, but argued from our premises. "The heavens do declare his glory, and the firmament shows forth the works of his hands. Day after day utters speech, and night after night teaches us knowledge." But they are only witnesses—the position which they prove is another matter; for the position and the proof are two things. That there is one God, creator and upholder of the universe, is the position which all creation witnesses. But the question is, Are the witnesses and the thing witnessed the same; or can nature and our five senses, aided by our intellection, both originate the idea and prove it? We say they can prove, but not originate the idea. Our friend Waterman, (and we have a very great respect for his judgment,) and with him a mighty host of learned men, say, that without the Bible, without revelation, a man can, by the exercise of his reason, through his external senses, on the face of the universe, acquire the idea of God, and the proof of his existence too.

We happen to be so constituted that the evidence which convinces them does not convince us. It is indeed true, that amongst Christians this is a very remote question, and one on which they may differ without any disadvantage among themselves: but not so with the Atheists. In arguing with them one argument is enough. They must admit that the idea of one Great Spirit is in the world. If they say, (as they do,) that it did not come into the world by revelation, then we ask them, how came it into the world? This they cannot demonstrate on any principle, unless they assume the position of the natural religionists, (amongst whom I do not like to see my friend Waterman,) and affirm that man can himself, by imagination, invent it. They will not say that philosophy or revelation teaches it, but that men have imagined it. We then ask them how the human mind can imagine it? Then, on their own concessions, they are stranded.

Now as we reason, those who differ from us on this subject lose this argument, and are therefore comparatively impotent in their attacks on Atheism. No Atheist has ever yet succeeded against this argument, and, in my judgment, never can.

But to return. No person has yet been produced who has acquired the idea of God in any other way than by revelation or tradition. None can be produced. And moreover, our most zealous champions for human ability on

this subject, when pressed, have conceded, and will again concede, that the idea of God which is acquired in their way, is a very incorrect idea; for it supposes not the existence of spirit at all. It is a material God, and not a Spirit, which they concede is derived from the volume of nature.

I attempt no more at this time than to show how little the natural religionists gain and how much they lose by their philosophy, and have no idea at present of fighting this metaphysical battle over again. The time may come when we may feel it to be our duty to affirm and prove, with the renowned Newton, that "God gave man reason and religion by giving him *speech.*"

One thing is certain, that man in Paradise was not placed there to acquire the idea of God without revelation; for God spoke to him: and it appears very unseemly that now, when fallen and impaired in all his faculties, he should be placed in the world to learn that which he could not learn in Eden before his apostacy from God.

Approving as I do, of the preceding essay in its general scope, and differing only in this single position from the reasonings of our intelligent and liberal-minded correspondent, I add no more than the above note.

NOTE B.

Our author demonstrates that we have need of a demonstration against Atheism: for neither miracle, nor angel, nor testimony can convince the Atheist. Why then demur at our ascribing all knowledge of God to supernatural revelation, as this gives us an argument nigher demonstration than any the philosopher ever urged—nay, it is in fact a demonstration.

Professor Stuart on the Mode of Baptism.

NO. I.

PROFESSOR STUART, of Andover, Massachusetts, so well known in the literary and religious world, so celebrated in those departments of literature connected with biblical criticism, has, in the April number of "*The Biblical Repository*," presented an essay of 103 octavo pages on "*the mode of baptism*," in answer to the question, "Is the manner of Christian baptism prescribed in the New Testament?"

The high reputation of Professor Stuart, so well deserved, as we think, gives an importance to this treatise which could not be claimed for any treatise on this question from the pen of any other American author. The candor of the writer too, is, perhaps, unrivalled amongst his contemporaries, and demands for him a most respectful hearing. We have accordingly read this treatise with all deference and attention, and have no hesitation in saying that it is an essay of very superior merit, and that, in our opinion, it will greatly subserve the cause of reformation in these United States.

The author is a Paidobaptist; one, who, in some sense, believes in infant sprinkling, and is therefore entirely free from the suspicion of any undue partiality for immersion. He has rendered the most peculiar service to the cause of immersion—a service which not one man in an age can render. To explain the peculiar difficulty of this service, I will illustrate it by a case somewhat parallel. When we have overpowered the sceptics on the resurrection of Jesus, with an immense cloud of witnesses in attestation of the fact of his resurrection

on the third day, they have replied, 'Your testimony is all one-sided, all Christian; your witnesses are all friends, all believers in that event: but let us have only one witness from the other side, one who was not a believer in the resurrection, and then we will concede the whole matter.' They seem not to think how difficult, nay, how impossible it would be to produce a witness in favor of the resurrection from amongst those who disbelieved it: for so soon as any one admitted this fact he ceased to be an unbeliever; he is then on the side of its friends. Now this may illustrate the peculiar service which our liberal and candid Professor has rendered the cause we have so long plead. His is the most rare testimony. If not the testimony of an unbeliever in the divine authority of immersion, it is the nighest approach to it which we suppose ever was made, or ever will be made. *A single circumstance*, which will appear in the sequel, was only wanting to have placed him on our side, and then his testimony would have lost with the multitude of Paidobaptists all its charms, all its peculiar power; but for that circumstance it would have been no better than ours. We must, therefore, tender our most respectful thanks to the Professor for the service he has rendered; and were it not that his witness to the truth is of so much the more value, standing as he does, we would regret, that after having made so good and so honest a confession, he should be deprived of all the benefits resulting to the humble and obedient disciples of the Messiah, from an intelligent immersion into his death.

The temper of our author is also as commendable as any attribute of his character. He writes with all suavity of manner, and shows a very high regard for the feelings of every class of readers. Upon the whole, it may be said his is a work of unrivalled merit, and one which will do more than any other which we have seen, in settling the minds of all conscientious and diligent students of the Bible.

The occasion of its appearance is also worthy of notice. He was called upon, both by Baptists and Paidobaptists, to express his views on the import of the original words anglicised *baptism* and *baptize*; and therefore he does not obtrude his views upon the public, but appears upon the arena at the solicitations of the immersed and the sprinkled. These things premised, we now proceed to the examination of the Essay.

His first section is headed, "Form and classical use of the word *Baptizo*."

As much depends on the classical or current acceptation of the words in dispute, we shall allow the Professor to speak on our pages fully on this part of the subject.

After enumerating all the derivatives from the etymological root BAP, such as *bapto*, *baptizo*, *baptisis*, *baptisma*, *baptismos*, &c. he proceeds to state as follows, (p. 290—293:)—

"The leading and original meaning of BAΠ, seems to have been *dipping*, *plunging*, *immersing*, *soaking*, or *drenching*, in some liquid substance. As kindred to this meaning, and closely united with it, i. e. as an effect resulting from such a cause, the idea of *dyeing*, *coloring*, *tinging*, seems also to have

been often associated with the original root, and to have passed into many of its derivates. For example; *βαπλος, dipped, immersed, colored; βαπλω, to dip, plunge, dye, color; βαφις, a dyer,* usually limited to this signification; *βαφη, dipping, plunging, immersing, the act of coloring, coloring stuff* or *matter, dye; βαφικος, what belongs* or *is appropriate to dipping, immersing,* or *to coloring, dyeing; βαφικη* (sc. *τεχνη*) *the art of dyeing; βαφειον, a dyer's workshop; βαψις, the act of immersion,* or *of dyeing; βαφιμος, to be immersed,* (quasi *immersable,*) or *to be colored;* all of which show, that there is a frequent interchange of meaning in the above derived words, and a similarity between them all; and also that the two ideas of *immersion* and of *dyeing* or *coloring* lie at the basis of the words derived from BAΠ, in most of their forms; although, in a few cases, *usage* has confined some particular words among these derivates solely to one class of meanings; e. g. *βαπφις, a dyer; βαπφειον, a dyer's shop; βαπτισις, immersion, submersion,* &c. Such a limited usage of these derivative nouns, however, is probably the result merely of convenience and custom, and lies not in the original nature itself of the words thus employed; for as they are obviously from the root BAΠ, so they might be employed, if usage had thus determined, like nearly all its other numerous derivates, in the twofold sense of *dipping* or *immersing,* and of *dyeing* or *coloring.*

For the present I merely state the fact in relation to these several meanings of the root BAΠ and its derivates. The reader is desired particularly to notice what has been stated, viz. that most of the nouns derived from BAΠ have a twofold sense, that of *immersion* and that of *dyeing;* yet some of them are employed only in one sense exclusively, either that of *immersion,* or that of *dyeing.* We shall see, in the sequel, that the verbs *βαπτω* and *βαπτιζω* have distinctions of meaning analogous to these,—distinctions which are never confounded by usage, while they both agree in one common and original meaning, viz. that of *immersion* or *plunging.*

In the brief view given above, I have supposed the *original* and literal meaning of the root BAΠ, to be that of *dipping* or *plunging;* and accordingly I have arranged this meaning so as to stand first in order. Still some may be disposed to consider this as not altogether certain. They may, perhaps, maintain that the idea of BAΠ was *to tinge, dye,* or *color;* and that the idea of *plunging* or *dipping* was derived from this, because, in order to accomplish the work of dying, the act of plunging or dipping was necessary. But as the idea of *immersing* or *plunging* is common to both the words *βαπτω* and *βαπτιζω,* while that of *dyeing* or *coloring* belongs only to *βαπτω,* it would seem altogether probable that the former signification is the more usual and natural one, and therefore more probably the *original* one. Accordingly I have so arranged it in my statement above; but at the same time, it should be understood, that the signification of *dyeing* or *coloring,* as attached to the word *βαπτω,* and many forms derived from it, is not less certain than the signification of *dipping* or *immersing.* If the reader will keep this in mind, he will be enabled in the sequel easily to solve some cases, concerning which there has been dispute, among those who have defended views that widely differ in regard to the manner in which the rite of baptism should be performed.

In addition to the two fundamental meanings of the word *βαπτω,* as derived from BAΠ, there are other derived or secondary meanings of the word, which will of course be noted in the sequel, when we come more fully to consider this subject."

After showing that there is no radical difference between *bapto* and *baptizo,* dependent on the form, he proceeds, p. 297:—

"On the whole, I am unable to make out for verbs in *ζω,* any peculiarity of meaning, as appropriate to them only. Not even where they are derived from more simple verbs, does such a difference always, or even more usually, exist. It follows, then, that we are to regard *baptizo,* so far as its mere *form* is concerned, and unless there are special reasons for viewing it differently, as only an example of a *prolonged* and secondary form of a verb, of which there are

so many scores of examples in the Greek language, particularly in the Present and Imperfect tenses.

Dismissing then the question of mere *form*, let us now inquire, whether in actual usage *baptizo* has a different meaning from *bapto*. In particular, is it distinguished from *bapto* by the writers of the New Testament?

The answer to these questions will be fully developed in the sequel. I have already intimated, that *baptizo* is distinguished from *bapto* in its meaning. I now add, that it is not, like this latter word, used to designate the idea of *coloring* or *dyeing;* while in some other respects, it seems in classical use, to be nearly or quite synonymous with *bapto*. In the New Testament, however, there is one other marked distinction between the use of these verbs. *Baptizo* and its derivatives are exclusively employed, *when the rite of baptism is to be designated* in any form whatever; and in this case, *bapto* seems to be purposely, as well as habitually, excluded.

Let us come now, for the fuller development of this matter, to the more important part of our inquiry under the first head, viz. *What are the classical meanings of bapto and baptizo?* In some measure I have been obliged to anticipate the answer to this inquiry, in the statements which I have already made; but I come now to the exhibition of the *grounds* on which we must rest the positions that have been advanced, and others also, which are still to be advanced.

1. *Bapto* and *baptizo* mean *to dip, plunge,* or *immerge,* into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. My proof of this position, need not necessarily be protracted; but for the sake of ample confirmation, I must beg the reader's patience, while I lay before him, as briefly as may be, the results of an investigation, which seems to leave no room for doubt. Take the following examples from the classics."

Homer, Pindar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Heraclides, Ponticus, Herodotus, Aratus, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, Plato, Epictetus, Hippocrates, Strabo, Polybius and Josephus are formally and expressly quoted to sustain this radical, capital and characteristic meaning of bapto and baptizo.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Divine Assistance.

THE aid which God gives to his creatures, consists not in his performing for them what he has qualified them to do for themselves, but in furnishing them with the means of doing for themselves, what, without the means furnished by him, their capacity of action would be of no avail. This is the character of Divine assistance, wherever we find it given, except in the cases called miraculous.

First, God performs none of those numerous actions for man, on the performance of which man's corporal or animal happiness depend; he only furnishes the capacity and the means of performing them. He ploughs no man's field, he sows no man's seed; he reaps no man's harvest; he grinds no man's grain; he bakes no man's bread; he plants no man's vineyard; collects no man's grapes nor converts them into wine; he manufactures no man's cloth, nor cuts nor sews it into garments.

And secondly, As he performs for the welfare of the human being, none of those corporal actions, for the performance of which he has qualified man, and furnished him with the means of performing himself; so for the advancement of human happiness he performs none of those mental actions, which he has qualified the human mind to perform for its own advantage, and furnished it with the necessary means. He looks, he hears, he tastes, he smells for no man.

He thinks, he meditates, he reasons, he judges for no man: nor does he perform for any man the operations which we ascribe to imagination, memory, attention or conscience. Moreover he reads, comprehends, believes, repents, reforms for no man: nor does he love or hate, sorrow or rejoice, or feel any of the emotions incident to our nature for any member of our race. No, all these actions man must and does perform for himself. But if man must perform all these actions for himself, what does God contribute towards their performance? I answer, he furnishes capacity, means and motives: and the answer may be easily proved to be correct by an analysis of every sort of action performed by man: but I mean at present to examine its truth only with respect to that class of mental actions termed religious.

1. When the human mind acquires the knowledge of God and divine things: does God perform this action for it or does he merely assist in its performance by furnishing the necessary capacity and the necessary means of information, and by presenting the most powerful motive of its incalculable benefit and advantage to the acquirer to rouse his soul to action?

2. When the human mind believes or admits the truth of what God has declared, merely because *he* has declared it, does God perform the act of believing for the believer, or does he only furnish the declarations to be believed, attested by his own infallible veracity, and in order to excite the mind to the performance of the act of believing what God has declared, propose to it in clear language the immeasureable advantage of divine faith, that is of believing what God has declared? Thus we perceive what man contributes towards the act of faith or believing, and what God contributes. God bestows the capacity necessary to enable man to perform the act: he also furnishes the means without which the act, notwithstanding man's capacity, could not be performed: and he furnishes and proposes the inducement which excites to its performance, and man thus excited exerts the capacity bestowed upon him or believes.

3. When one repents, does God perform the act of penitence for the penitent; or does he only furnish the capacity necessary to enable man to repent; and the information, consisting in a clear revelation of God's will, and an express declaration that every impenitent contemner of that will shall be eternally miserable, without which repentance, notwithstanding capacity, is impracticable; and the all-powerful motive of escape from eternal misery by repentance, to excite the sinner to perform the penitential act? Here again God furnishes capacity, means and motives, and aided by these the creature performs the act.

4. When one reforms, does God perform for him the actions either mental or corporal in which his reformation consist? Or does he only furnish the capacity which their performance requires; and the information which makes known the actions both mental and corporal, in which reformation consists, and exhibits the motive, consisting in the boundless advantage of reformation to the reformed, to excite the depraved to reform. When God therefore commands his creatures to reform, what does he do? Manifestly to exert the capacity which he has bestowed on them, of using the means with which he has provided them for becoming acquainted with the actions, mental and corporal, in which reformation consists, and of considering or reflecting on the motive, namely, the immense advantage of reformation, till it has excited them to perform the actions in which reformation consists.

5. When one loves God, delights, rejoices, or confides in God, does God perform these actions? Or does he only furnish the capacity which man exerts in their performance, and such a declaration or exhibition of his own lovely attributes and actions as is when duly attended to and reflected on, calculated to produce the emotions of love, delight, joy, confidence and gratitude in the hearts of his creatures? Are we then desirous to have these emotions excited in our minds towards our maker, let us read, let us dwell on the account which God has given us of his lovely perfections and beneficial actions, let us meditate then, till these emotions are awakened within us.

6. But perhaps we have analysed actions enough to prove that man is the

performer of all religious actions, and God the furnisher of the capacity, means and motives, which enable him to do so.

PHILALETHES.

FROM THE NEW YORK COURIER.

FALSIFICATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

IN RUNNING our eye lately over some of the public papers, we were struck with the following notices of the Holy Scriptures, to which we beg leave to call the serious attention of those, whose peculiar duty it is to guard the purity of that source, from whence springs the faith of so large a portion of mankind.

"*Falsification of the Scriptures.*—A reverend gentleman in England, named Curtis, has recently made some appalling disclosures in relation to the careless and iniquitous manner in which the University editions of the Holy Bible, published by the King's printer, are put forth to the world. Mr. Curtis has exposed some enormous errors, and variations from the original text, as given in King James' time. Six hundred mistakes have been found in one book, and eight hundred in another; many of them most important, and all of them inexcusable. Some of the grosser ones, which would seem to have been concerted and intentional, have been rife for forty years. The true sense of Holy Writ, it is contended, has been greatly warped by these errors; and measures are in train to have them ratified, in all future editions of the Scriptures published in England. It is stated that the churches in America have long since adopted the edition in question as *a standard;*—if so, it is of the last importance, we should conceive to import one of the corrected copies, now preparing, at the earliest period. The writer remarks, with much sorrowful feeling, that such perversions of the Sacred Word have given rise to more scoffers and infidels, than could have been otherwise produced by any other cause."

"It is announced that Dr. Noah Webster, the lexicographer, is engaged in preparing for publication an edition of the Bible, in the common version, but with amendments of the language, chiefly in the following particulars—

"1. The correction of errors in Grammar.

"2. The omission of obsolete words and phrases, and the substitution of equivalent terms now in use.

"3. The use of euphemism for such indelicate words and phrases as are most offensive, and which cannot be uttered without pain both to the reader and hearer."

In regard to the falsifications and mistakes of the Bible, noticed in the first article, there is great reason to fear that they extend far beyond the "University Editions published by the King's Printer." In the multiplicity of editions we see every day palmed upon the world, without any sanction or authority whatever, by booksellers and soci-

eties and denominations and sects of all sorts, where is the security that the text may not be altered to suit the peculiar tenets of each particular sect, or marred by the carelessness or ignorance of the publishers? We have heard it asserted, and from the hurried manner in which these Bibles are multiplied almost to infinity, we believe it to be true, that many of the common editions are scandalously inaccurate, if not wilfully falsified, to sanction the peculiar tenets of the sects by whom they are published. The common people who have in a great degree lost their reverence and value for the Sacred Book, from the usual effects of too great plenty, receive it without enquiry, though there is no security whatever for its accuracy, and no sanction of church or state to guard against interpolation, corruption or mistake.

These things ought not to be. The Bible is too important a volume to be left thus at the mercy of ignorance, carelessness, or wilful interested falsification. It should come forth with the sanction of some high and responsible authority, and carry with it evidence that it has undergone the strict scrutiny of persons, whose learning and integrity sufficiently guaranty the public against deception and falsehood.—As it is now, we really see no obstacle to publishing Bibles to suit any system of morals or religion, and whose precepts may outrage every principle of the Decalogue. Living as we do under a Government which neither interferes nor allows of interference in religious matters, it is without doubt difficult, if not impossible, to prevent impositions of this kind, since there is no law that we know of to prevent a man from publishing any book he pleases under the denomination of the Holy Bible. Still the evil we speak of is not the less to be deplored; and we cannot but recommend it most earnestly to the attention of all those who would preserve the Scriptures from degenerating by degrees into a heterogeneous jumble of contradictory and irreconcileable inconsistencies. The few doctrinal differences originating in the two translations of the Bibles of the Catholic and Protestant faiths, detract but little from the divinity of the Scriptures; but the eternal multiplication of these differences, must, in the end, entirely destroy their force and authority, and undermine the very foundations of our faith. When it is seen that they sanction the most opposite and incongruous opinions, and that those who agree in nothing under heaven, can find in the Scriptures authority for all their differences, it cannot but happen that reflecting minds will begin to doubt the infallibility of an oracle so liable to be misinterpreted.

But if we have read the statement on the authority of Mr. Curtis, with pain, we have viewed the notification of Dr. Webster with indignation and contempt. We look upon the project of dressing up the Doric simplicity of the bible in all the trumpery of "euphemisms," as little less than impiety, as an attempt to strip the book of life of its very life, its beautiful simplicity—its childish unconsciousness of giving offence by calling things by their right names, which gives it such a character of unequalled grandeur and purity. Does not Dr. Webster know that nothing is so well calculated to call up an offensive image in the mind, as that affected squeamishness under which lasciv-

iousness may be and so often is masked? Is he ignorant that offensive ideas may be as easily conveyed by circumlocution or "euphemisms," as by the plainest words? or that the truly delicate and virtuous mind revolts ten times more indignantly at the one than the other, because the former is an attempt to cheat it into toleration by artifice and disguise, while the latter comes in the garb of simple truth at least?—What should we think of Dr. Webster dressing up Moses and the Prophets in the costume of a dandy of the present day; or decorating Sarah, Rebecca and Esther in the multifarious trumpery of a modern fine lady? Yet this would not be more supremely ridiculous and not half so mischievous, as *reforming* the Scriptures into the pompous, artificial rhetoric of the present day. We beseech the Doctor to stick to his spelling books and dictionaries and let the bible alone. We believe him to be a pious man, and that he would not intentionally make the scriptures ridiculous by translating them in "euphemisms."

With respect to the correction of grammatical errors, if the Doctor means such as have crept in by means of that carelessness and perversion to which we have heretofore referred, well and good. But if his intention is to play the pedant with the book of inspiration, and adapt it to his notions of the beauty and purity of grammatical construction, then we say the Lord deliver us from Dr. Webster and his bible!

The second object of the Doctor is the "omission of obsolete words and phrases, and the substitution of equivalent terms now in use."—Now, to our poor apprehension, there is not a single word or sentence in the bible which requires the doctor's pruning knife; or that he can make clearer by all his circumlocution and euphemisms. There is not in the English, or in any other tongue, living or dead, a book of more clearness of language than the bible. It is a perfect model, and no man living can touch without defiling it, or alter without polluting its divine simplicity. We cannot think with patience of a bible decked out in the rhetoric of the modern school, and our faith in it would be almost as much shaken by altering its language, as by falsifying its precepts.

Lastly. The Doctor contemplates, by the aid of "euphemisms," to disguise such ideas as cannot be expressed in plain English "without pain, both to the reader and hearer." We have been all our lives accustomed to think, that indecency, or smuttiness, consisted as much in ideas as words. Now, if the Doctor would do away entirely with these alleged scriptural indecorums, he must not only alter the words, but the ideas, by the aid of his euphemisms; in other words—he must alter the Scriptures; in plain English falsify them; for no one doubts that these ideas are found in the original as well as in the translations. Where this system of alterations would end no one can tell, since that squeamishness in language, which is ever the result of relaxation in morals, might come, in time, to take exceptions at other words and ideas which had escaped the skittish delicacy of Doctor Webster.—Truly this is a wonderful moral age; it is assuredly more afraid of

naughty words than naughty actions. We have editions of Shakspeare, and other fine old authors, with the brains knocked out, under pretence of making them fit for family use; and we are now threatened with an edition of the Bible; stripped of its simplicity, its very identity, by the aid of euphemisms and circumlocutions; though it is acknowledged on all sides, that the simple, brief directness of the bible language, is not only its greatest beauty, but its strongest barrier against error and misinterpretation.—We say, therefore, to Doctor Webster, once again, stick to Spelling Books and Dictionaries—deluge the country with one, and confound the universe with the other—make, alter, mar and mispell, as you please, but spare us, we beseech thee, the Doric simplicity, the unaffected beauty, the brief, unstudied manliness, the naked truth of the Book of Life. Away with your euphemisms, grinder of genders, and scavenger of words!"

WE have ouly room to remark on the above Extracts, from the New York Courier and Enquirer, that Mr. Curtis' complaints, corroborate some statements which we made some years ago, upon the numerous errors, which have crept into the common version. We felt authorized to say, on the documents then in our possession, that the people are not now in possession of King James' version. There are many alterations and departures from the 1st Editions of that work. But of this again.

What is said of the carelessness and incompetency of the numerous printers and publishers of the scriptures, to say nothing of the interference of sectarian zeal, is no doubt worthy of credit. It requires, we know from experience, the patience of an ox and the eye of an eagle, to superintend an edition of the New Testament. We never saw an edition of the New Testament free from errors. Even in the New Version of the single epistle to the Romans, by Professor Stuart, from the literary press of Andover, under the supervision of one of the most competent revisers of the press, a whole verse, or a part of two verses, is left out of the text. It is to be feared too, it will be perpetuated in the English Editions of that valuable work. As to Dr. Webster's project, we will not now say much. We are opposed as much as the writer of the above article can be, to tampering with the simplicity of the style and language of the Sacred Scriptures, and to the irresponsible attempts of every one who takes it into his head to improve the grammar or phraseology of the common Translation. Yet we cannot concur with him, in the profusion of praise, which he pours upon the errors and faults of the common version, nor in the overflowing measures of censure, with which he repays the temerity of Dr. Webster. We are of opinion, that the Doric simplicity of 1 Samuel 25. 22. and of many similar passages, would be as much preserved in saying "any male" or "every male" as it is in the common version. Euphemisms are necessary: and in the King's version there are euphemisms, vulgar as it now is, which depart as far from the original, as is necessary to all emendations required in the present age. But of this also again; We are persuaded that had the caprice of the above writer, placed him on the side of Dr. Webster, he could have found as many commendations of his plan as he has found faults in it. But we neither defend Webster's project, nor attack the Courier's criticism upon it. There is right and wrong, truth and error, and extremes on both sides. These matters will soon require more of our attention.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

KING AND QUEEN, 8th April, 1833.

"AGREEABLY to appointment, we met at Acquintain church, in King William, on last Friday, and continued from day to day until Monday afternoon.

A joyful season has it been. Not many were added, or came forward, but the most extraordinary peace, amity and joy animated the confluence of disciples. We had truly a multitude of these present; far beyond our calculations. We were favored with the presence and aid of about sixteen proclaimers of the ancient gospel, the greater part of whom perhaps, addressed the public in the course of the meeting. We broke bread on Lord's day in a congregation of from five hundred to a thousand disciples, it is supposed, a very extraordinary scene indeed. The points whence the disciples came, were numerous and very remote. The circumstances were heart-moving; teaching us to give glory to God, while we took courage in the good cause in which it has pleased God to lead us. Surely Jesus the Messiah must be at the helm of affairs, or we should not under present circumstances, have been thus blessed. I have no wish to boast in this happy state of things, but in Christ Jesus, to whom be all praise and glory! His works, ways, and means, as well as ends, are of the marvellous in our eyes. But you would like to know whether we made any laws, or in any way attempted to re-organize Messiah's Kingdom for its more rapid and unobjectionable spread. No; we forbore to add any thing as to faith or manners, but earnestly pressed upon all to regard the already perfect work of the Lord, and act accordingly.

Though this meeting has been remarkably numerous, and well attended by those who are for going forward in the reformation, yet, from different causes, there are churches and ministers of the same mind, who did not attend. But I have no doubt, that the cause of truth is dear to their hearts, and will guide them in their course.

We contemplate holding a similar meeting in Richmond in the course of October next, to which, the attention of the disciples will be invited, in due time.

I have not designed to be very particular in this communication, as I heard brother Henley say, he should send on an account of the meeting at an early day. Taking it all in all, unless it has happened in the western part of our country, I should say that such a meeting has not occurred for many centuries. Much greater men have often met—many more converts have been made—much more splendid doings, after their kind, have been exhibited,—but it has seldom happened during the last twelve of fifteen hundred years, that men separated by a space of five hundred miles have assembled with the word of God as their guide, to proclaim it to sinners as the only infallible instrument of salvation. Considered as to design, objects, means, faith, hope, obedience, spirit, the body here conjugated, may be emphatically called *one*; at least so far as we are enabled to judge from circumstances. May we soon attain the glorious consummation of our Lord's wish as to a perfect unity! Then shall we be indeed sanctified, and all men know that we are the disciples of our Master. We should thus be enabled to do mankind good, and glorify God."

J. DU VAL.

After giving substantially the same account of the aforesaid meeting, Brother T. M. Henley says—

"THE urgent calls upon us, to visit the different parts of the State, were truly impressive. We have got the promise of brother Ainslie to continue to spend a great portion of his time in travelling among the churches. We in this neighborhood all having large families and in limited circumstances, have agreed to extend our labors. We are increasing in numbers in every direction around us. Some of the most intelligent and wealthy part of society have treated the *Dover Decrees* with contempt, united themselves with us, by faith and immersion—Several at our co-operation on Monday, made the good confession.

We are yet in our infancy, and hope we shall by the favor of our heavenly Father, ere long "go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall." Had you but seen and heard old brother Short, sixty-five years of age, (a man of but little education,) lifting up his trembling hands, and feeble voice, teaching the an-

cient gospel in simplicity and godly sincerity, you would have been cheered.—The countenances of the brethern when he gave us his parting address, spoke in terms of approbation of the correctness of his discourses. He said he felt for his Baptist brethren, having himself lived so long under the systems of men—He was now resolved to die in the service of his Lord and King.

We agreed to have a co-operation meeting in October next, in the City of Richmond, where we hope again to meet our beloved brethren by the favor of our King.

Yours in hope of a better life.

THOMAS M. HENLEY."

Roman Catholic and Protestant Controversy.

MOST of our readers have, no doubt, heard of the controversy, pending between the so called *Reverend* John Hughes, on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, and the so called *Reverend* John Breckenridge, on the part of the Protestant Presbyterian Church, on THE RULE OF FAITH. Although we have not noticed this Controversy in our periodical, we are not wholly inattentive to its progress. We intend a Review of it, but we wait for its termination. It is so far evident, and we expect to make it plain to our readers, that in most instances in which Mr. Breckenridge has successfully vanquished his opponent, it has been by a *pro tempore* abandonment of his own Creed, and an adoption of some of our most prominent positions, for which we have been, by this same Mr. Breckenridge and others of his brethren, denounced hetrodox. Presbyterians and Episcopalians, cannot successfully, wage war against the Mother Church, and hold fast the traditions which they have received from her. This is now, more than ever, apparent from this controversy, and from another carried on in New York, between Messrs. Brownlee and the Priests of that city.

EDITOR.

BEGGING FOR THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS.

THIS is quite a respectable business. The new school got up in Virginia, it is said, is to have three agents employed, one of them at $800 per annum, and two at $500 each. Thus the raising of the funds for this institution, will cost the liberal and devout Baptists, 1800 dollars per annum. Mr. Ball, of the Herald, it is said, is to be one of the 500 dollar men—Mr. John Kerr is to have 800 dollars—and the other, from whom I expected better things, is of Mr. Ball's Class. If then the brethren contribute 1900 dollars for the school, 100 only finds its way into the treasury, propelled by the aforesaid machinery.

Though the report comes to me in a very feasible form and from a source entitled to credit, I am unwilling to vouch for its truth, thinking that there must be a mistake somewhere. It is, however, of importance that it be corrected, if it be unfounded, and therefore we call upon Mr. Ball, to disabuse the public mind on this subject, and to let the people know the whole truth in the case.—Silence, or any suppressed or partial statement, will only increase our suspicions that these institutions are got up more for the sake of the priesthood than for the sake of the people.

EDITOR.

To Agents.

To Agents in whose hands some copies of the 2d Edition of the New Translation, remain unsold.

IT appears from the accounts received from our Agents, as well as from our books, that there is a number of these Testaments unsold. We wish them to present all the copies now on hand, of the 2d Edition, to such of their acquaintance as are unable to buy, and who are desirous to obtain the book, with one injunction only, that they will give the books a careful reading. ED.

To Correspondents—Brother H. Grew in our next.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Number VII.——Volume IV.

Bethany, Va. July, 1833.

Signs of the Times.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'Corkle,—*a Layman.*

(Continued.)

AMIDST a cloud of witnesses justifying a day of calamity; one of much notoriety may be found, Rev. 14. beginning at the 14th verse. The passage presents us with a figure of the most tremendous bloodshed the world has ever seen, and no doubt has an allusion to the same event, pointed at in the 34th of Isaiah: "And their land shall be soaked with blood." Also, in the 64th, "I have trodden the wine press alone," "for the day of vengeance is in mine heart." We must look forward for these events, for we cannot look back to a time when they may have had an accomplishment.

If it was not for one consideration, I would expect the terrible bloodshed to be confined to the Catholic Church. There are two angels represented as having sharp sickles. First, "And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth, and the earth was reaped." The second angel was directed, "Saying, thrust in thy sharp sickle and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth, for her grapes are fully ripe," &c. "And the wine-press was trodden without the city."

I am persuaded the first sickle is to have its sweep upon the world at large; I cannot think there is any allusion, which would give it a discriminate application, nor would I pretend to say what it is to be—war or pestilence, or both,—some destroying angel is destined to reap the world. Blood is to consummate the mission of the second angel; probably near the seat of antichrist, there will be "the battle of that great day of God Almighty." I tremble for the fate of Europe—the

kingdom of antichrist—for years past have I said, that Europe was soon to be a field of blood—for there is the empire of the beast—the jurisdiction of the mother of harlots, and inspiration says, "in the cup she has filled, fill to her double." The pouring out of the second and third vials, must relate to this devoted church, and is equally terrible with blood. See Rev. 16. "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea. And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of water, and they became blood. and I heard the angel of the waters say, thou art righteous, O Lord, &c. because thou hast judged thus: for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink, for they are worthy."

Now, who has shed the blood of saints? An answer to this question, will shew on whom the second and third vials are to be poured, and probably on whom the figure of the wine press is to have its most special accomplishment. Yet, Christianity in the aggregate may properly be considered the "vine of the earth." Let these predictions be fulfilled, as they may, or on whom they may, they are not calculated to fill the mind with peace.

What spot on earth can offer any local security—being beyond the jurisdiction of the mother of harlots, can by no means afford an assylum, a city of refuge, from the sickle which is to be thrust into the earth. Nothing but the seal of the living God, on the forehead, will afford safety in this perilous time. We are admonished thus, Luke xxi. 34. "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your heart be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and the cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come upon all them that dwell upon the face of the whole earth." We may not doubt respecting the extent of the scourge; just as far as iniquity abounds, so will the snare encompass—like the flood it will involve the whole human family.

Now, was there ever a time when the world so emphatically suited the description, "overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and the cares of this life." Spiritual drunkenness predominates in the church, and temporal in the world. In vain does human effort oppose itself to the mighty tide of vice. Where the laws of God cannot restrain men from drunkenness, human institutions will not long do it. And for years past; "the cares of this life," the lusts of the eye, &c. have been gaining apace. Speculation is rolling with the width of an ocean, aad the rapidity of a torrent. Is not gain the devotion of the age—the pulse of almost every exertion? What will be the situation of the world in half a century, if the money making mania, is suffered to go unchecked? Men are compassing sea and land for the sake of gain. Idolatry has only assumed a different garb, while the devotion is the same. Men are running to and fro, and knowledge on the increase, ("signs of the times") and about the time they have made the earth subservient to their purposes, listed winds and tides, lands, rivers and lakes into their service, the charge of om

nipotence will be sounded; a day of reckoning, of retribution called; a day which will try men's souls, try their works, and set a proper estimate on things of this world. Not he that saith, Lord, Lord, but he who will be found obeying the commands of the Master—obeying the gospel—will be accepted in that eventful day; a day nearer at hand than the world is aware. The omens appear, the harbingers are visible—pestilence and war! Nothing but the seal of the living God on the forehead, will be a security from the shafts of the destroying angel.

I will here offer a few remarks on the seal of the "living God," and the prediction contained in the 7th of Revelation—but few passages in the sacred oracles more fraught with alarm, or less attended to. Ignorance will be but a poor excuse for those who have a Bible in their hands. "And after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the winds should not blow on the earth, nor on the sea, nor any tree. And I saw another angel ascending from the east, having the seal of the living God: and he cried with a loud voice to the four angels, to whom it was given to hurt the earth and the sea, saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of God in their foreheads." Now there are several things of no small consideration presented in this prediction taken as a whole.

First, a sealing; then, a destroying power, or powers let loose upon those who have not the mark of discrimination on the forehead. It is plainly implied that there are certain ministers of destruction, held, restrained until certain purposes are effected, a sealing operation performed. It is plainly implied that this sealing is to close, is to be finished: and it is as unequivocally implied in the passage, that, at the close of this sealing, those four winds, those ministers of destruction, are to be let loose to hurt the earth. This perfectly corresponds with those predictions which we have already examined, and is not a strained construction. They are broad and pointed features, prominent in the face of the above quotation from "the revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass."

Now I would ask the candid reader, what is the seal above alluded to? Examine the forehead of christendom for this token. Where is it to be found? How few, alas! present to the view of human discernment the great leading features of the christian religion—peace, joy, long suffering, meekness, forbearance, brotherly kindness, faith, hope, charity! I hazard a broad assertion, that the sacred oracles will condemn ninety-nine hundredths of the professors of the Cnristian religion.

Now if christendom presents not to view the seal of the living God, if this seal be rarely found, may we not fairly say, the sealing time is drawing to a close, a few impressions yet making, yet to be seen. A few more years will terminate the period of time allotted to the reign of antichrist; a few more, to human appearance, will close the sealing

time under the present dispensation; a few more years and the winds will be let loose to hurt the earth. A few more years, and the dread order will be given to the seven angels, "Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth."

There is no knowledge of greater importance than to know the meaning of God's word; and among the most fatal errors will be that of misapplying the prophecies. On this rock the Jewish church split. They misapplied predictions on which their salvation depended. The safety of the Gentile church is standing in jeopardy at this very time, on this very ground. Predictions relative to Christ's second coming and his universal reign are perverted or not understood. Similar faults, similar fates. The Jewish church fell upon the *stone* and was broken; the *stone* is to fall upon the Gentile, and grind it to powder.

I will now take up some of the most prominent prophetic parables of the Master. If I have been right in my views of the other prophecies, most of these can be brought to bear with equal effect on the same object—*to wit:* the dissolution of the present, and the introduction of a new dispensation. [See Matth. xiii. 24. &c.]

I had long looked at the parable of the tares, and doubted its legitimate application to the close of time; and upon reading a translation coming from the hand of a learned D. D. in the Presbyterian church, I was confirmed in the belief that the parable of the tares is misapplied when the final judgment is taken for its object. "Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field; but while men slept his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way," &c. "Let both grow together [the tares and wheat] until the harvest." Now is this a different harvest from that named in Rev. xiv. 15.—"For the harvest of the earth is ripe"? We must couple relative scriptures together. In Revelation there is not the most distant allusion to a general judgment. An objection may be brought from this text—"The harvest is the end of the world." The term *world* is often used with a very different meaning from the material world; often relates to dispensations, or the people of the world, (see 2 Peter, iii. 6.) "Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." The people perished. See Cor. x. 11. "Upon whom the ends of the world are come." This is a very unintelligible saying, applying it to the world in the common acceptation. But the passage in consideration is thus rendered in the translation alluded to above: "The harvest is the conclusion of this state." In the whole chapter, and in other places, where the common version reads "end of this world," it is rendered "conclusion of this state." With this reading doubts may be entertained that the material world is not alluded to. And taking the parable together in all its bearing, I am honestly induced to believe it is to be fulfilled in its utmost extent previous to, or at the introduction of the Millennium. Admit that all the predictions relative to the kingdom of Christ are to have an accomplishment on earth; that at the close of time the kingdom is to be given into the hands of the Father, that God may be all in all. I say,

this admitted, would set the matter at rest. But Paul is not sufficient authority opposed to tradition; nor are the very plain words of the Master believed relative to himself, by thousands who are expecting salvation through his name.

The parable is thus explained by its author: —"The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world, (conclusion of this state,) and the reapers are the angels." As, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world, ('conclusion of this state.') The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, &c. Alas! what will be left? Will names and parties stand in this eventful day? The discriminating eye of the Master is to superintend—angels are to be the executors of his orders.

Now in all the parables contained in this 13th of Matthew we do not find any thing to favor a dissolution of nature—no conflagration in the case, nor even a resurrection pointed at; and seems, but for one word, to be relative to the inhabitants, the living inhabitants of the earth, without disturbing the common course of nature, and that one word doubtful in its application to the material world. Nor is there any thing connected with this discrimination, this separating of the wicked from the righteous, which may not take place a thousand years before the final resurrection. But I have other and stronger reasons for believing that this parable of the tares is to have its accomplishment before, or at the introduction of Christ's universal reign. The very first feature of this reign precludes entirely the existence of these tares. At the outstart of this reign there is to be nothing to hurt or offend. None shall have need to teach his neighbor; all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest; and righteousness is to cover the earth as the waters do the great deep, and men learn war no more. Many quotations might be made, bearing testimony respecting a state of the most consummate happiness and felicity on earth; nothing to hurt or offend. Now where the room for these tares? They cannot exist in the Millennium. But look into the present dispensation, and they compose a conspicuous part of the crop, and grew up at an early period, and are to grow together with the wheat until the harvest. Now this harvest is unavoidably to take place before the Millennium, or we are to have a full portion of evil with the good throughout that period, notwithstanding the many pledges God has given to the contrary. In this parable there is not the most distant intimation respecting a change of existence, or a change of worlds; but, on the contrary, those who do iniquity are to be removed, are to be "gathered out of his kingdom." What! gathered out of heaven!

Is this a different kingdom from that predicted by Daniel, when "one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him; and

there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and tongues should serve him." But our clerical gentry can locate all these things in the worlds above—people, nations, and languages! and many other things quite as absurd, are palmed on the credulity of a misguided world. We trust the great concerns of eternity in the hands of other men, into the care of blind guides; while, with the most scrupulous care, we manage matters relative to this short and uncertain state of existence, ourselves.

There is another argument, strong to the point, that this parable of the tares and the harvest spoken of, is to have its accomplishment a thousand years before the close of time. It is simply this: The Master saith, "The enemy that sowed them [the tares] is the devil." Now, reader, just turn to the 20th of Revelation, and read a prediction there respecting this very devil who sowed these tares. He is to be bound a thousand years, and to "deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled." How is he to sow tares among the wheat when cast into the bottomless pit, shut up, "and a seal set upon him."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Letter 2, from Charles Cassedy, Esq.

NEAR PULASKI, TENNESSEE, June 7, 1833.

To Alexander Campbell, &c. Bethany, Va.

RESPECTED SIR—I have just received the 5th number, vol. 4, of the *Millennial Harbinger*, containing the concluding letter of your very able reply to my communication of the 29th October last. I need not remark to you, that the numbers addressed to me in the Harbinger, have been perused, and, indeed, reperused, both by myself and many others, with all the attention and depth of interest they so *vitally* and *richly* merit. The manner in which you have treated the difficulties I stated to you, has induced me to peruse with attention your debate with Mr. Owen; respecting which I have only to remark, that I consider Mr. Owen's *theory of human happiness* perfectly impracticable in its application to society and mankind; that his views of the future destinies of the human race, are *unspeakably* and *horribly destructive* of those consolations which spring from HOPE, the last comfort of afflicted humanity; and, that the gloomy and appalling spectacle of *future* and *entire annihilation*, which his doctrines hold forth respecting the ulterior and everlasting *oblivion* of the HUMAN SOUL, if recognized and accredited by mankind, would dissolve the individual and social affections of our race; destroy all the moral, civil, and political obligations of society; lay waste all those sacred, long cherished, and endearing ties, which bind man to his progenitors and his posterity; render this life entirely valueless, in almost every way in which it is not connected with *mere sensuality;* and utterly annihilate that lofty and ennobling SENTIMENT OF IMMORTALITY, which seems to

be the *distinctive characteristic* of our race! Mr. Owen certainly had the worst and most untenable side of the question; his arguments, his doctrines, and his *future views* of human destiny, seem to me to be the offspring of cold insensibility to the affections, the passions, and the future hopes of our race; and to emanate from the *ashes of a sensibility* absolutely consumed in the frozen, stoical, and oftentimes *barren speculations* of reason. The present state of the human race, under all its apparent disadvantages and calamities, seems to me better to comport with the natural and essential characteristics of man, than any condition in which Mr. Owen's doctrines, if even admitted to be authentic and practically efficient, could possibly place him. Admitting that man is not now in the state in which he was created, his *nature* did not preclude his POSSIBLE FALLIBILITY; and, if by the exercise of his *voluntary powers*, without which he could not be rendered accountable for his misdeeds, he degraded himself and his race to a condition of turpitude and moral dishonor, I cannot distinguish, notwithstanding Mr. Owen's arguments and views, that the present state of the human race is *at war* with the nature and essential principles of the human character. And, sir, to conclude my remarks respecting this debate, and you will certainly give me credit for *ingenuousness* and *impartiality*, knowing as you do that I professionally belong to neither side, I am decidedly of opinion, that your depth of historical research, and philosophic energy of argumentation in that debate, if they have ever been equalled, were, in my estimation, never excelled by any theologian of either ancient or modern days. This, you will say, is a salutary acknowledgment from a man who dares to think for himself, whose whole life has been dedicated to intellectual improvement, and who has always sought to test the *truth* or *error* of all theological creeds, by the broad principles of justice, reason, and nature.

Your vigorous and unremitting efforts, aided by the zeal of your coadjutors, will probably and ultimately be successful, in bringing back the church of Christ to its primitive purity and simplicity, and in stripping vital and genuine religion, so apparently essential to the prosperity and happiness of man, of all its *ambitious assumptions* of temporal power, and all its *sectarian armor* of belligerent holiness, factional piety, and gregarious and cruel intolerance. The assumption and militant exercise of *temporal power*, by the Romish church, in my opinion, gave origin to many, if not all, the early dissensions from that church, and sectarian filiation to those numerous and often contradictory creeds which have sprung from those early dissensions. This assumption of temporal power, by the church of Rome, and the uses which have been made of it by the *sectarian scions* of that church, have been fatal to the happiness of mankind, and the cause of genuine religion; they have retarded the march of rational and conscientious liberty, entangled the human mind in cobweb glooms of superstition, and disgusted thousands of individuals of liberal, enlightened, and elevated minds, who would not or could not, under such emotions of disgust, distinguish between *pure* and *adulterated* Christianity. The admixture of temporal power with ecclesiastical interests and doc-

trines, has been a fruitful source of not only error, but misfortune to mankind; it has enabled ecclesiastical hypocrisy, cupidity, and unhallowed ambition to rob, to scourge, and to debase mankind; and it has equally enabled political and military ambition to enslave, and perpetuate through successive ages, a galling and most degrading bondage, physical, moral, and intellectual, of millions of the human race. If I am not mistaken in my recollections, Christ himself abjured the assumption of temporal power when offered to him by the Jews, by explicitly declaring that his kingdom was not of this world; and yet we see that the Popes and other prelates of the Romish church grasped at and exercised all the temporal power possible to be *usurped*, for the purpose of supporting their creeds, and compelling mankind, by the sanguinary butcheries of the Inquisition, to embrace the doctrines of that church. But, sir, we need not resort to the historic annals of ancient times for proofs of the avidity with which temporal power and secular influence are sought for by sectarian professors of Christianity. A few years only have elapsed, since in this republic, happily characterized by political, religious, moral, and intellectual freedom, an attempt was made, by a powerful combination of *religious sectarians* and *hypocritical demagogues*, in nearly every portion of the union, to force Congress into the measure of stopping the mails on Sunday; and, if I am not egregiously mistaken, and I am very certain I am not, a contemporaneous movement was also made by some of the *sectarian Doctors* of the church, for the establishment of a NATIONAL RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, which might relieve our citizens of the intellectual drudgery of thinking for themselves, and enable them to *believe in Jesus of Nazareth, and find their way to heaven by* ACT OF CONGRESS.

With great and sincere respect,
I am, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES CASSEDY.

[The above favor from our friend Charles Cassedy, Esq. speaks for itself. We think it due to him and the public to let it appear in this work. The only objection which we had to the publication of this letter, is the too flattering terms in which the eloquent writer has spoken of the debate with Mr. Robert Owen: but as he regards this as an act of justice to himself, it became us not to suppress any part of his letter, but to give it entire, without note or comment, to our readers.] EDITOR.

Sherlock on Divine Providence.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 251.]

LET us, then, now more particularly consider how God governs mankind, so as to make them the instruments and ministers of his providence in the world. The methods of the divine wisdom are infinite and unsearchable, and we must not expect fully to comprehend all the secrets and mysteries of God's government; but something we may know of this, enough to teach us to reverence God, and to trust in him, and to vindicate his providence from the cavils of ignorance

and infidelity, which is as much as is useful for us to know. And I shall reduce what I have to say to two general heads:—1. The government of men's minds, of their wills, their passions, and counsels. 2. The government of their actions.

1. God's government of the minds of men, their wills, and passions, and counsels; for these are the great springs of action, and as free a principle as the mind of man is, it is not ungovernable: it may be governed, and that without an omnipotent power, against its own bias, and without changing its inclinations; and what may be done, certainly God can do; and when it is necessary to the ends of Providence, we may conclude he will do it. Let a man be never so much bent upon any project, yet hope or fear, some present great advantage or great inconvenience, the powerful intercession of friends, a sudden change of circumstances, the improbability of success, the irreparable mischief of a defeat, and a thousand other considerations, will divert him from it; and how easy is it for God to imprint such thoughts upon men's minds with an irresistible vigor and brightness, that it shall be no more in their power to do what they had a mind to, than to resist all the charms of riches and honors, than to leap into the fire, and to choose misery and ruin!

That thus it is, the Scripture assures us, (Prov. xxi. 1.) "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord; as the rivers of water, he turneth it whithersoever he will." And if the king's heart be in the hand of the Lord, we cannot doubt but he hath all other men's hearts in his hand also, and can turn and change them as he pleases. Thus the wise man tells us, "A man's heart deviseth his ways, but the Lord directeth his steps." Prov. xvi. 9. Men consult and advise what to do, but after all, God steers and directs them which way he pleases; for though "there are many devices in a man's heart, nevertheless the counsel of the Lord that shall stand," (Prov. xix. 21.) which made the wise man conclude, "Man's goings are of the Lord: how then shall a man understand his own ways?" Prov. xx. 24. That is, God has such an absolute government of the hearts and actions of men, when his providence is concerned in the event, that no man can certainly know what he himself shall choose and do; for God can, in an instant, alter his mind, and make him steer a very different course from what he intended. As the prophet Jeremiah assures us, "I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Jer. x. 23. And Solomon tells us something more strange than this "The preparation of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is of the Lord;" (Prov. xvi. 1.) or as the Hebrew seems to signify, *the preparation of the heart is from man;* a man premeditates and resolves what he will say; but notwithstanding that, *the answer of the tongue is of the Lord.* When he comes to speak, he shall say nothing but what God pleases. Which sayings must not be expounded to a universal sense, that it is always thus; but that thus it is whenever God sees fit to interpose, which he does as often as has any wise end to serve by it.

Thus we are told, that "when a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." Prov. xvi. 7. And it is a very remarkable promise that God makes to the children of Israel, that when all their males should come three times every year to worship God at Jerusalem, by which means their country was left without defence, exposed to the rapine of their enemies who dwelt round about them, that "no man should desire their land, when they go up to appear before the Lord." Exod. xxxiv. 24. We have many examples of this in Scripture, and some of those many ways whereby God does it. When Abraham sojourned in Gerar, he said of Sarah his wife, that she was his sister, and Abimelech, the king of Gerar, sent and took her; but God reproved Abimelech in a dream, and tells him that he had withheld him from sinning, and not suffered him to touch her. Gen. xx. 1, &c. Thus when Jacob fled from Laban with his wives and children, and Laban pursued him, God appeared to Laban in a dream, and commanded him that he should not speak to Jacob either good or hurt. Gen. xxxi. 24. Such appearances were very common in that age, though they seem very extraordinary to us; but God does the same thing still by strong and lively impressions upon our minds—by suggesting and fixing such thoughts in us, as excite or calm our passions, as encourage us to bold and great attempts, or check us in our career by frightful imaginations and unaccountable fears and terrors, or by such other arguments as are apt to change our purposes and counsels.

Sometimes God does this by a concurrence of external causes, which at other times would not have been effectual, but shall certainly have their effect when God enforces the impression.

Thus God in a moment turned the heart of Esau when he came out in a great rage against his brother Jacob. It was an old hatred he had conceived against him for the loss of his birthright and of his blessing. And he had for many years confirmed himself in a resolution to cut him off the first opportunity he had to do it. And could it be expected that the present which Jacob sent him, which he could have taken if he had pleased without receiving it as a gift, and that the submission of Jacob when he was in his power, should all on a sudden make him forget all that was past and the very business he came for, and turn his bloody designs into the kindest embraces? No! this was God's work, the effect of that blessing which the angel gave to Jacob after a whole night's wrestling with him in Penuel. Genes. xxxii. 33. And when God pleases, the weakest means shall change the most sullen and obstinate resolutions.

Of the same nature of this is the story of David and Abigail. Nabal had highly provoked David by the churlish answer which he sent him, and David was resolved to take a very severe revenge on Nabal and his house. But God sent Abigail to pacify him, who, by her presence, and dutiful and submissive behavior and wise counsels, diverted him from those bloody resolutions he had taken, as David himself acknowledges: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who sent thee this day to meet me, and blessed be thy advice, and blessed be thou

who hast kept me this day from coming to shed blood, and from avenging myself with my own hand." 1 Sam. xxv. 32, 33.

Saul pursued David in the wilderness to take away his life, and God delivered him twice into David's hands; and the kindness David showed him in not killing him when he was in his power, did at last turn the heart of Saul, that he pursued him no more. 1 Sam. xvi. and xxvii.

Thus God confounded the good counsel of Ahitophel by the advice of Hashai, which Absalom chose to follow. And the text tells us this was from God, who had purposed to defeat the good counsel of Ahitophel, to the intent that he might bring evil upon Absalom. 2 Sam. xvii. 14. Such an absolute empire has God over the minds of men, that he can turn them as he pleases, can lead them into new thoughts and counsels with as great ease as the waters of a river may be drawn into a new channel prepared for them.

2. When God does not think fit to change and alter men's wills and passions, he can govern their actions and serve the ends of his providence by them. When God suffers them to pursue their own counsels and to do what they themselves like best—he does that by their hands which they little expected or intended. The same action may serve very different ends; and therefore God and men have very different intentions in it. And what is ill done by men, and for a very ill end, may be ordered by God for wise and good purposes; nay, the ill ends which men designed may be disappointed, and the good which God intended by it have its effect. And this is as absolute a government over men's actions as the ends of providence require, when whatever men do, if they intend one thing and God another, "*the counsel of God shall stand*," and what they intended shall have no effect any further than as it is subservient to the divine counsels; as to give some plain examples of it:—

Joseph's brethren being offended at his dreams and at the peculiar kindness which their father Jacob showed him, resolved to get rid of him; but God intended to send him into Egypt, to advance him to Pharaoh's throne, and to transplant Jacob and his family thither. And therefore God would not suffer them to slay him as they first intended; but he suffered them to sell him to the Ishmaelites, who carried him into Egypt, which disappointed what they aimed at in it, never to see or hear more of him, but accomplished the decrees and counsels of God.

Another example we have in the king of Assyria, who came against Jerusalem with a powerful army with an intention to destroy it; but God intended no more than to correct them for their sins. This God suffered him to do, but he could do no more. "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation: I will send him against a hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire in the street." Thus far God gave him a commission; that is, thus far God intended to suffer his rage and pride to proceed. But this was the least of his intention:

"Howbeit, he thinketh not so, but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few." But in this God disappointed him: "Wherefore, it shall come to pass, that when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his proud looks." Isa. x. 5, 6, 7, 12.

A great many examples might be given of this nature, but these are sufficient to show what different intentions God and men have in the same actions, and how easily God can defeat what men intend, and accomplish by them his own wise counsels which they never thought of. When God has no particular ends of providence to serve by the lusts and passions and evil designs of men, he commonly disappoints them; that when "they intend evil, and imagine a mischievous device, they are not able to perform it." Psal. xxi. 11. Or he turns the evil upon their own heads: "The heathen are sunk down in the pit that they made; in the net which they hid, is their own feet taken. The Lord is known by the judgment which he executeth. The wicked is snared in the work of his own hands." Psal. ix. 15, 16. Or he doubly disappoints their malice, not only by defeating the evil they intended, but by turning it to the great advantage of those it was intended against; which was visible in the case of Haman, whose malice against Mordecai and all the Jews for his sake, did not only prove his own ruin, but the great advancement of Mordecai, and the glory and triumph of the Jewish nation.

[TO BE CONTINUED.

Methodistic Calumny.

OUR friends of the Methodist Christian Advocate and Journal and Zion's Herald, of May 31, have thought it worthy of them to turn their clerical artillery against us. The following quotations from the most popular Journal in the world, shows how little talent and how little knowledge is necessary to make a man popular, whom Fortune, in her capricious moments, makes the tongue of a large and powerful denomination. The good sense of the denomination will no doubt disapprobate his course, and therefore we will not charge upon the 24,000 readers of this New York Editor his sins against religion, courtesy, and the grammar of our mother tongue.

The reader, as he proceeds, will please refer to our notes on the text, in numerical order. *Ed.*

"ERROR IN THE WEST.

The letter which we give below should fix the attention upon, and arm the hearts and minds of our Zion, against the specious and insidious errors which it mentions. The history of the Christian church, for many centuries, reveal this fact as a powerful admonition, viz.—when churches or ministers espous the seducing idea that all religious standards of faith, or creeds, which the re searches and experience of the wisest and best have compiled, as an *expositio* of the doctrines and ordinances of the Bible, are to be disregarded, such

churches and ministers have ran into grievous heresies. [1.] To discard all such standards of faith, instead of being an evidence of liberty of thought, or independence of mind, is a clear proof of supreme vanity and self-importance. By so doing, the individual disregards the patient and persevering researches and labors of those who have gone before him: he makes no account of the testimony, experience, learning, and success of the church for nearly two thousand years. [2.] He takes supreme delight in declaring that he is free and competent, and will think for himself, by which he means, that he will think differently from other people, in order to prove his independence of thought. [3.] The first result of this vain effort is, that he embraces some radical error, which, without his perceiving at first probably, leads to many legitimate and ruinous consequences. Such we believe to have been the case with the new divinity in the Calvinistic churches, and Mr. Alexander Campbell, of the Baptist church, in Western Virginia. [4.] There are certain doctrines, which, if you embrace them, or either of them, are inevitably followed by certain dangerous errors. When Mr. Campbell was not suspected of Socinianism, we said to one who admired him somewhat, *He will come out an Arian.* [5.] Our friend was almost grieved at the severity of our censure. But what is the fact? Mr. Campbell has joined his influence with Mr. Barton Stone, long known as the leader of western Arians, commonly called New Lights, or, as they call themselves, Christians; and their parties have united. [6.] Before Mr. Campbell came out fairly an Arian, (he may deny this term now for aught we know—the fact is nevertheless true,) he did immense injury to the Baptist church in the West. [7.] Now had this church possessed a well digested creed and sound discipline, all this might have been prevented by putting away from among them the author of this dangerous error. [8.] There never was an age in

---

1. Amongst whom Martin Luther, John Calvin, and John Wesley stand conspicuous.

2. The Protestant reformers, one and all, made very little account of the experience, learning, and success of the church for 1400 years; about as much account do we make of the experience, learning, and success of Methodism for 100 years.

3. If John Wesley had not thought differently from all his contemporaries, it is a question whether the Editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal and Zion's Herald would have thought at all about Methodism.

4. Who required you to make such confession of your faith?

5. Charity hopes all things. You were a false prophet, then, upon your own showing: for A. Campbell detests Arianism: and he that says he has come out an Arian, says what he cannot prove; and is a calumniator just as flagrant as he who says A. Campbell is a thief or a murderer.

6. This is also false. A Campbell never has joined his influence with Barton W. Stone as an Arian. There are many persons who have united with A. Campbell, Catholics, Methodists, and Presbyterians, in the work of reformation; but he that hence infers that A. Campbell has come out a Catholic, a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, has no brains, or is a knave.

7. What immense injury did John Wesley to the Episcopal Church of England!

8. Had the Methodist Episcopal Church "possessed a well digested creed and sound discipline," how happily might she have prevented the immense injury which the Radicals have done her. But, alas! her creed and discipline were like stubble and chaff before the wind!

which the church of God was so imperiously called upon to "hold fast the form of sound words," and "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," as the present. [9.] The elements of Socinianism, Arianism, Pelagianism, and Unitarianism are rife in our land, and ready to break in upon the church of God every where. Ministers and people should be awake, and not be taken by specious professions of orthodoxy or religious friendship. Does a minister clearly intimate some doubts about the doctrine of "original sin," or does he give it such a refined and novel explanation as to destroy its force? His error is fatal. [10.] If there be no constitutional or native sinfulness inherent in the soul, it does not need to be *regenerated:* it cannot be regenerated for the better. Having *contracted* pollution and guilt only by actual transgression, all that is necessary is to *reform* and *mend* our ways. It follows next that the atonement of the Saviour is not *vicarious* and *propitiatory*, because there is no necessity that it should be. It needs simply to be *testamentary* in order to act as a *moral suasive* to induce us to submit ourselves to God, and this submission is conversion. From this it follows, that there is no direct agency of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the sinner, creating it anew. Indeed, most of those who come thus far, either doubt or distinctly deny the presence and operations of the Holy Spirit as an actual intelligent agent. The whole of this matter is resolved into the *moral force of truth, motive, and suasion.* Then comes the resulting error of doubting, and finally denying the essential and unoriginated divinity of our Saviour; for this very sufficient reason, that for all the purposes of the above scheme of salvation a *created being* is competent, and nothing more was required. Most of these erring speculatists say, that this creature is the *head of the creation*, "the first born of every creature," next to God himself; yet, as we heard one of them say, [11.] in a sermon in Ohio, "Not the *thirtieth* part of a God!" It is distressing to recollect this tremendous blasphemy. But we repeat it to warn our readers of the dangerous tendency of the new divinity of the day, both in the West and East.

Finally, without incurring the censure of vanity or egotism, let us say, upon the ministry, local as well as travelling, and upon the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, rest, to a large extent, under God, the responsibility of breasting this flood of error, and guarding the church from ruin, because of our extension and unity of faith. [12.] Let us earnestly and constantly pray

---

9. This is a great truth; and if even Satan tell the truth, he ought to be believed. This is just what we call upon our contemporaries to do. But is it possible that this writer can imagine that his creed and discipline is that "form of sound words," and that "faith once delivered to the saints," of which Paul spoke? Can he for a moment imagine that his form of sound words and the faith which John Wesley delivered to the Methodists, are one and the same with the New Testament!

10. To doubt of original sin, is, in the judgment of the Methodists, a fatal error. Not of all Methodists, for I know of many exceptions, amongst whom John Wesley is one. But it is with "Zion's Herald" a fatal error.

11. Will the gentleman name this "*one of them*," that we may know what "*them*," and what *one* of them was guilty of such blasphemy. I have sent to this gentlemen a copy of my reply to Henry Grew with a request to do me justice. We shall soon see whether it is any part of this gentleman's "form of sound words" to do justly and to abstain from detraction, slander, and calumny.

12. "Because of our extension!" The Catholic Church had still a greater latitude of extension: but one Monk has kept them busy for 300 years, and yet they have not guarded the church from ruin. The

that God may enable us to meet this responsibility to the glory and honor of his excellent name.

"*Dear Brethren*—We have a great variety of doctrines (which we think erroneous) to contend with. What is sometimes called Campbellism, or the peculiar doctrines of A. Campbell, of Bethany, Brooke county, Va. appears to produce the greatest excitement at present. The advocates of these views deny all creeds, confessions, and disciplines, and profess to be governed in all things by the word of God alone, without construction. [13.] They strongly inculcate "immersion for the remission of sins," and lay a peculiar stress on *baptism by immersion only.* [14.] To use the words of A. Campbell, they "regard the *blood of Jesus Christ as the procuring cause* of the remission of sins; *faith* in God's testimony as the *principle* of our *enjoyment* of remission; and *immersion* as the *means divinely appointed* for our *actual* enjoyment of this first and greatest of present blessings. Immersion nor faith procures remission. The *blood* of Jesus, through the favor of God, *procures; faith apprehends;* and *baptism* LAYS HOLD OF THE BOON OF HEAVEN, *or is the means of our enjoyment.*" See A. Campbell's remarks on Dr. Cleland, No. 2, last paragraph in the Millennial Harbinger. The same writer says, in Christian Baptist, vol. 2, No. 9, p. 207, 208, "Such is the constitution of the human mind, that a man is *as passive in believing* as he was in receiving his name.....Consequently no man can help believing," &c. I would quote more, but I will not trouble you with this kind of stuff. (15.) I would just observe, that his work is industriously circulated, and is producing a number of secessions from the Baptist churches of the old stamp: two or three only have I known, however, to be carried off from the Methodists by them. [16.] These Reformers, as they are sometimes called, say, that "we have no authority to say that the baptism of the Holy Spirit ever saved or cleansed any subject of it. This baptism was only for the confirmation of the gospel, and continued with the church till this end was effected, and no longer." See B. W. Stone in Christian Messenger for January last, p. 17, vol. 7. I have only mentioned these things, brethren, that you may know, that while you have to contend with what is called "new divinity," in New York, that we, in the far West, have to contend with error in almost every form. But you have a host to go up against the mighty, and we only a handful.

Help us by your pens to stop the mouths of gainsayers, and help us by your prayers.

Excuse the freedom I have taken to fill my sheet with hints on subjects in which you may not feel interested, inasmuch as I feel while I am writing, like

---

Methodist church has great extension, it is true; but it would require many miles long of such writers as the above to resist the power of one man who feared God, loved Jesus Christ, and held fast the form of sound words once delivered by the Apostles to the saints.

13. Not the whole truth. We require every man to confess his faith before he is immersed; but if our friend *Red*man had said human creeds, &c. we should let it pass.

14. We know no way of performing immersion by sprinkling or pouring. If the gentleman will teach us how we may immerse a person by sprinkling him, we shall give him our thanks for the discovery.

15. This kind of stuff does very well. It is easy to call any thing "*stuff.*" Even Mr. Redman is nothing else but stuff, from head to foot, inside and outside. If he were *good* stuff I should never regret his being called *Red*man.

16. We could tell him of some hundreds of Methodists who have done themselves the highest honor by renouncing the little peculiarities of a sect for the ancient gospel and order of things.

adopting the language of a worthy brother, "*If I were rich I would offer a premium*" (17.) for a tract or essay written on each of the subjects alluded to, especially on the influences of the Holy Spirit, and creeds.

I am, dear brethren, yours in Christ,

W. W. REDMAN.

Howard county, Mo. April 18, 1833."

Letter from Henry Grew---Part 1.

Dear Brother Campbell,

I GRATEFULLY acknowledge your kindness in replying to my queries. Our friendly discussion (1.) will, by the divine favor, tend to the development of the truth. We happily agree to shun both "the high and cold latitudes of metaphysical theology." We wish not to travel out of the record. Our mutual desire is simply to understand *the revealed facts* respecting the one God, and the one Lord.

Who is the one God? I reply, with the testimony, "*The Father.*" 1 Cor. viii. 6. You also say that "in the economy the Father is our *only* God, and Jesus is our only Lord." Are we not agreed? (2.) Or do you suppose that there has been, or will be, an economy, in which the Father was not, or will not be, the only God? (3.) Was he not the *only* God, when the Son or Word enjoyed glory with him "before the world was," (4.) for which very glory the Word prayed in the time of

17. All the premiums that can be bid upon creeds and human theories will not keep them at par. Mr. Redman, you may save your money and give it to the poor. EDITOR.

1. I did not intend any discussion of this or any similar question, convinced, as I have long since been, that such discussions are interminable, and have no good practical tendency. I answered brother Grew's queries in all candor; but had no intention of discussing or debating this matter; and shall not now do more than publish his letter with a few notes.

2. Perhaps not exactly; for is not 1 Cor. viii. 6. spoken with a reference to "the gods many and lords many," and not in relation to such questions as have grown up out of the Alexandrian school? The phrase "*to us*" is equivalent to Christians or persons living under and acknowledging the new economy.

3. This question is answered by asking another: Does any one suppose that there has been an economy (such as the Jewish) in which the Son was not the only Lord?

4. This is rather a singular question. Has it not been intimated in my replies that the word "*God*" was a *relative* term? There can be no *Father* when there is no *Son*—no *God* when there is no *Satan*—no *good* when there is no *evil*. Our much esteemed brother Grew appears not to have reflected upon the peculiar import of the term *Jehovah*, as stated in my replies. The Father may, in strict propriety of speech, be *the God* as well as *Father* of Jesus Christ; but not *the Father* and *the Jehovah* of Jesus Christ. So teaches the Bible—so speak the Apostles.

his humiliation? Was he not *dependent* on the Father for that glory for which he *prayed?* (5.) This could not be the prayer of the *humanity* which had no existence "before the world was." Will not the Father be the "*only* God" after the present economy, when our triumphant King shall deliver "up the kingdom to God, even *the Father*," and "the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God be *all in all*?" 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

Although you understand the Father to be the only God, in the new economy, you remark, that "*there is, and was, and evermore will be, society in God himself, a plurality as well as unity in the divine nature*, are inferences which do obtrude themselves on my mind in reflecting upon the divine communications to our race." Now, beloved, are not these two propositions absolutely at variance? Is it possible that the idea of a society of persons (which is the idea you attach to the word society) in the one God, can obtrude itself on your mind without immediately and entirely excluding the idea that "the Father is our only God?" You cannot retain both. (6.) Which, then, demands your preference—the idea of the *plain positive testimony* that the Father is the one God, or the idea *inferred* from passages susceptible of different constructions?

You allow not "words without ideas to which this word Trinity has given birth." In reference to this "society in God," you use the term *person* rather than *being*. Have you *an idea* of any distinction? I suspect, brother, that your remark, "I am not much in love with either," arises from the conviction of your intelligent mind, that there is no difference which has any bearing on this important subject. Can you possibly conceive of a "society" of persons, each of which possesses infinite perfections, without conceiving of a family of supreme Gods? I do not require you to explain a declaration of revealed truth, which, in some respects, is incomprehensible. I require, what your principles allow me, the idea you attach to the term (not a scriptural one) "society in God." What is it, if it is not what I have stated? (7.)

---

5. "He made himself poor." He became subject and dependent. "Though he was in the form of God, he did not affect to appear in divine majesty, but divested himself, taking upon him the form of a servant." Phil. ii. 7. *New Version.*

6. We cannot feel this difficulty, unless it be in using the phrase "God himself," or "the divine nature," in an accommodated sense; for that there is not solitude but society in Jehovah, is not incompatible with the proposition that the Father is our only God and Jesus our only Lord.

7. I can conceive of society, communion, unity, and plurality in Jehovah, just as easily as I conceive that he is *the Self-Existent.* Self-existence, or unoriginated being, is to me as unreasonable and as reasonable, as incomprehensible and comprehensible as society, unity and plurality of person, existence or being in one self-existent.

After stating your "inferences" respecting this society in the Deity, you add that "common sense, reason, and revelation, give one and the same testimony, in my ear, upon this subject." Yet in the preceding paragraph you remark, "Were any one to ask me, Can there be three distinct persons, or even beings, in one God? I would say, *Reason informs me not, and Revelation does not assert it!!*" (8.)

Shall we now, my dear brother, review the premises whence you draw your inference that there is a "society in God," i. e. (unless we proceed without ideas) a society of *persons or beings*. You quote Gen. i. 26. "Let *us* make man in *our* image, in *our* likeness," &c. Here the idea of a *plurality* of beings (the number neither expressed nor implied) engaged in the work of creation, is obviously revealed. Now to the testimony for explanation. What is it? That three equal persons were engaged therein? No; but that "God created all things *by* Jesus Christ." Eph. iii. 9. "By whom he made the worlds." Heb. i. 2. Which, then, is most consistent with Holy Scripture, to infer that the one God the Father, OF whom are all things, said to his Son, the one Lord BY whom are all things, "Let *us* make man," &c. or to infer that one supreme God, or person, or being, said to two other supreme Gods, or persons, or beings, "Let us make man," &c. (9.)

You quote also John i. 1. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The first idea is that the Word existed in the beginning. What beginning? In the beginning of eternity? Has eternity a *beginning?* Again to the testimony. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." "God created all things by Jesus Christ." Jesus Christ, then, was with God when the heaven and earth were created. How does the fact, that the Word was "in the beginning," prove the eternity of the Word, any more than the fact, that God "in the beginning" created the earth, proves that *it* is eternal? Might not the Word or Son have existed before the earth, men, and angels, and yet not be eternal? Let us hear the voice of eternal truth. He is "the beginning of the creation of God." Rev. iii. 14. "The image of the invisible God, *the first born of every creature:* for by him were all things created," &c. Col. i. 15, 16, i. e. as the word of truth itself explains, God created all things by him. The Apostle's argument is, that if all things were made by him, he must have been *before* all: he must be "the first born of every creature." When it is said that all things were made by him, it is manifest that he himself is excepted, who is the *first begotten* of the Father. No being, finite or infinite, creates himself. We might as well insist that the strictly literal import of the declaration, "All things were made by him," implies that *he made the Father*, as that it implies that he himself could not be created. (10.)

---

8. No incompatibility: take both sentences in all their connexions.

9. I infer nothing about *supreme* or inferior gods. This language is not mine, and therefore let them who use it define it.

10. "*In the beginning*" is no part of time: for time was not until motion began. There was something to move before it moved. This something, then, was created before time began. The phrase, "*In the*

"When he bringeth in the *first begotten* into the world, he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i. 6. Are we not here plainly taught that he was the *first begotten* BEFORE he was brought into the world? "God sent *his Son* into the world." (11.) This implies that he was his Son *before* he was sent; as, I sent my servant, implies the previous existence of the relation. (12.) If this is denied, Rev. iii. 14. Col. i. 15, &c. clearly declare that our blessed Lord had a "beginning" of existence. (13.) Nor do we find a single apparent contradiction in all the record that his existence has been eternal. The word *eternal* is never applied to the Word or Son, or to any other of his varied and appropriate descriptive appellations. (14.) Nor is the term ever applied to the Father to justify the idea of eternal sonship.

The second declaration in John i. 1. is, "The Word was with God," i. e. (taking the book for our guide) the "first begotten," the first born of every creature, *by* whom God made all things, was with the Father. No man can have any intelligent idea of the affirmation, "The Word was with God," without conceiving of one being with another being; and if this were duly considered, the following clause would be quoted with less confidence as proof of supreme Deity. Having, then, re-

---

beginning," Gen. i. & John i. indicates before time. Now whatever was before time is to us eternal. It must be so: for the Word that was in the beginning began to create, and whatever was before creation was eternal. This is ontology, the very essence of abstraction.

11. Yes; before Jesus was brought from the dead, or before his Father commanded all the angels to worship him, he was the first begotten, "he is the first born from the dead, that in all things he may be pre-eminent."

12. I think not. Does the phrase "*God sent an angel*," mean that his angel or messenger was a messenger before he was sent? How could any being be a messenger before he was sent? He existed before he became an angel—but was no angel until sent. So the word says that holy offspring to be born of Mary "*shall be called* the Son of God." Cyrus, in anticipation, is called the servant of God; so God sent forth his Son, is in anticipation of "*the word that was made flesh.*"

13. Rev. iii. 14. and Col. i. 5. does not imply to me that Jesus was a creature who began to be when he began creation. The phrase, "the beginning of the creation of God," is equivalent to *the author of creation.* If I say Martin Luther was the beginning of the Reformation, I do not mean that he began to be, when he began the Reformation.

14. Neither is the word pure or the word good by any inspired person. Shall we thence infer that he was not pure nor good? Any thing with me is eternal which existed before creation. Before and after time, mortals know only eternity. Jesus is "the Alpha and the Omega," and before these there is no letter in the alphabet. He is the First and the Last; and before the first and after the last I know nothing.

ceived the idea from the testimony of one being associated with another being, we read next that "the Word was God," i. e. many say, *supreme* God. What, then, is the unavoidable consequence? What idea have such in their minds? Certainly the idea of one supreme God with another supreme God. (15.) But you say, this is the testimony, "The Word was God." Well, but are you sure the term *God* is not *here* used in a subordinate sense? Is it not a fact that it is sometimes so used in the divine record? What does the Father say to his beloved on this subject, when he gives him the high title of God? "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, *O God*, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom; thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore, God, *even thy God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Heb. i. 8. 9. Is it not here demonstrated that the Son, *as God*, has a God, and consequently that the term is applied to him in a subordinate sense? Surely the Father has no God. If he called them Gods to whom the word of God came, we have no cause to marvel if he gives this high appellative to his first begotten, who is a ruler of pre-eminent dignity, "being made so much better than the angels." (16.)

If you say that the term *God*, in Heb. i. 8. refers to his mediatorial office, but that it does not in John i. 1. I ask, what evidence have we that it was not "in the beginning" given him in a subordinate sense, as the constituted maker and ruler of all? However, I present you evidence that the Word is not called God in the highest sense in John i. 1. in the revealed facts. 1. That the word God is used in the scriptures of truth in a subordinate sense. 2. "There is but one God, *the Father*." 3. Jesus himself declares *his Father to be the only true God.* John xvii. 3. 4. He never called himself God. (17.) 5. He denied the charge of making himself equal with God, founded by the captious Jews on the fact that he had said that God was his Father, by the asseveration, "Verily, verily, the Son can do nothing of himself." John v. 19. (18.) 6. He affirmed that *his Father only* knew of the day of Jerusalem's destruction, and consequently that he did not know of it *in any nature.* Finally (though I could add more) he *prayed* for the very glory which he had with the Father before the world was.

I have carefully examined your remarks on the term *Word* in the Christian Baptist you kindly sent me. Whether it is, or is not true, that ideas and words are "coetaneous," I find no evidence that it was any part of the design of the Spirit of truth, in using this term, to

---

15. "Supreme God" is the language of Ashdod—not ours.

16. This supreme and subordinate sense will explain person, being, existence, plurality, unity, &c.

17. He assumed not "in the form of a servant" what belonged to him before "he made himself poor."

18. No: for so intimate was the union between the Father and his Son, that "whatever the Son did the Father also did."

teach us whether our Lord was or was not eternal. Various figurative appellatives are given our glorious Redeemer to delineate his incomparable excellency; but, ah! how inadequate is mortal language for such a theme!

> *"Nor earth, nor seas, nor suns, nor stars,*
> *Nor heaven his full resemblance bears."*

A figure may be a very appropriate medium of illustration in respect to one characteristic of our Saviour, and a very inappropriate one in respect to another. The term "Lamb of God," which is so beautifully significant of the great propitiatory sacrifice our Father has appointed, is altogether inadequate to set forth the *matchless might* of him to whom all power in heaven and earth is given. All figures and parabolic illustrations of divine truth must be explained by the plain testimony, or we may prove any thing we please. The true import of the term Word, as applied to the Son of the Blessed, is to be ascertained from the revealed facts. He is the Word OF God. The Father is the one God OF whom are all things: the Son is the one Lord BY whom are all things. He has declared unto us the Father's name. John xvii. 26. No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him. Thus, as a word is the medium of communication of our minds to one another, so the Son is the medium of the Father's communications unto us. You will not claim authority to infer any idea from the term Word as applied to the Saviour, which has no support in the plain testimony, much less an idea which violates that testimony.

To support the idea of "society in God," you ask, "How could man be created in the image of God, incomplete in one person, social, and necessarily plural; and that God, in whose image and likeness he was created, could be a solitary unit, without society and plurality in himself!" I reply, that the fact that man was made *rational, intelligent, and holy*, presents an adequate basis for the declaration that he was made *in the image of God*. Man's happiness is indeed "incomplete" without the woman; but the fact of his pre-existence as one intelligent being, demonstrates that the existence of the woman was not essential *to the existence* of that one intelligent being. (19.)

H. GREW.

---

19. It was only essential to his happiness. It was not good for man to be alone. God never was alone. But who by searching can find out God or know the Almighty to perfection? The knowledge of him is higher than heaven. What can you know? It is deeper than hell. What can you do? I am content to believe what I cannot comprehend, or else I must reject my own existence, as well as of the Self-Existent. But of this as we proceed with the remainder of the communication of our very intelligent and devoted brother.

EDITOR.

Conversation at Mr. Goodal's.

[*Continued from page* 224]

Mr. Reed.—THE angel which redeemed Jacob from all evil was no doubt the guardian angel of Jacob's people. This angel, we have much reason to think, was Michael the chief Prince. The following descriptions of this angel are worthy of attention:—

He is called the angel of Jehovah at the burning bush; and in Exodus xxiii. 20. he has a character given him which asserts the highest dignity. "I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared, Beware of him and obey his voice: provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgressions, because my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak, then I will be an enemy to your enemies, and an adversary to your adversaries. For my angel shall go before thee, and bring thee into the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off."

Mr. Williamson.—Have not many commentators supposed this to be Moses?

Mr. Reed.—Yes; but Moses did not bring them into the land of the seven nations, and consequently this applies not to Moses.

Mr. Williamson.—But may it not apply to Joshua?

Mr. Reed.—No; for Joshua did not keep them in the way to Canaan. This same angel appears to Joshua, chap. v. 13. "And it came to pass when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him, with his sword in his hand; and Joshua went to him and said to him, Art thou for us or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as Captain [Prince] of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth and did worship, and said to him, What saith my lord to his servant? And the Captain of the Lord's host said to Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place on which thou standest is holy; and (ver. 3, 6,) the Lord said to Joshua, See I have given into thy hand Jericho and its king," &c.

This angel of the Lord, this Prince or Captain of the Lord's host, was neither Moses nor Joshua. Both Moses and Joshua did him homage: he speaks for Jehovah. He is *the word of Jehovah*, and receives the honors due to him as his angel. The prophet Isaiah gives him the title of "the angel of Jehovah's presence." Speaking of the mercies and loving kindness of the Lord to Israel in past times, the prophet adds, (chap. lxiii.) "The Lord became their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and *the angel of his presence* saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them, and he bare them and carried them all the days of old." Michael the chief prince, or the Word that was made flesh, is referred to in this passage. He was "the angel of Jehovah's presence," "the angel of the covenant," "the captain of the Lord's host"—he that blessed Jacob, and gave him the name of *Israel*

Maria Goodal.—Does brother Reed think that "the angel of his presence" means the same as the promise given to Moses, (Exod. xxxiii. 14.) "My presence shall go with thee (Moses,) and I will give thee rest. And Moses said, If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence."

Mr. Reed.—I think "the presence of the Lord," and "the angel of his presence" represent the same thing. In both passages it is *faces*, "the angel of his faces," or "manifestations;" and they both relate to the same time, place, and people.

Father Goodal.—I incline to the judgment of my venerable ancestor, Owen of Cambridge, though I differ from him in some matters. He will have him who is now known as the Son of God, to be the person alluded to, as the word and angel of Jehovah, so often spoken of by Moses and the prophets. He alleges that he who is called *the angel of the presence* is in Hosea called the Lord

himself, (i. 7.) "I, saith God, will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God, and will not save them by bow nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses nor by horsemen." Again, speaking of the same persons, ch. xii. 3, 4, he says, "By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept and made supplication to him; he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us. Even the Lord of hosts; the Lord is his memorial." He that is called the angel and the angel of the Lord, is here called the Lord himself. Stephen also, in his speech, thrice applies this word to the Lord himself: "The angel of the Lord which appeared in the bush;" "the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush;" The angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai. This angel calls himself the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and Jacob, more than once. Hence I infer that Michael, (which signifies "*one like God*," or "*the image of God*,") "the angel of the Lord," "the angel of his presence," "the Prince or Captain of the the hosts," "the angel of the covenant," and all such titles are applied to him who before the Christian age began, was called "the word of God," the word which was made flesh. He was the chief of the princes and peculiarly presided over the people of Israel; and is it not every way acceptable that he who is now the ambassador of God to the whole race of men, was before his incarnation the president angel of the covenanted people, in anticipation of his humiliation amongst men. "He came to his own people, but they received him not.."

Mr. Reed.—Let us, then, leave this matter here, and proceed to the services which angels performed under the Jewish economy—not forgetting the question of our friend Mr. Williamson, concerning the origin of a guardian angel assigned to each person.

Father Goodal.—As a commencement to this part of the conversation, let me request brother Reed for his views of Stephen's words, Acts vii. 53.—"Who received the law by the disposition of angels."

Mr. Reed.—This, indeed, is the proper exordium of the services of angels under the law. For not only Stephen, but David and Paul call our attention to their services on Mount Sinai. David says, "The chariots of God are many thousands of angels—the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place." Psalm lxviii. 17. We are here taught that when the Lord descended to the Mount he was attended with many angels; and Stephen says, "Through the ranks or orders of angels the law was given to Israel." Paul says that "the word or law was spoken by angels," and that "it was ordained by angels in the hand of a Mediator"—i. e. Moses. Thus they waited upon God in the giving of the law, and put the tables of the law into the hand of the mediator Moses.

But as order is the first law of Heaven, and method is another name for reason, let us attempt to arrange the various services of angels under proper heads; and as Robert Fowler has been studying logic, let us ask him under what heads he would classify what is said on the services of angels.

Robert Fowler.—I would suppose that there are but two sorts of services which they could render man, viz. physical and moral; or that the bodies and minds of men are the objects upon which all their services must terminate. But in performing these distinct services it is necessary for them sometimes to operate upon animated and unanimated nature; and therefore, in examining the scripture upon this subject, I would notice what they have performed by both.

Mr. Reed.—Give us a sample, then, if you please, of their operations on matter.

R. Fowler.—They have taken to themselves bodies of human form, capable of reflecting light; and in these bodies they have performed all the actions of men; such as eating, drinking, talking, striking, pulling, walking, sitting, &c. For example, the angels who visited Lot in Sodom, stayed with him all night, eat unleavened bread; they put out their hands and pulled Lot into the house from the hands of the Sodomites; they shut the door, and smote the enemies of Lot with blindness. In the morning they laid hold on Lot's hand, and the

hand of his wife and daughters, and urged them out of the city, commanding him to hasten out of the reach of destruction. The angel that appeared to Manoah so much resembled a man in appearance, in speech, and gesture, that neither Manoah nor his wife could realize that he was an angel until he ascended in the flame of their sacrifice to heaven. An angel so operated on the air as to strike dead by a pestilence seventy thousand persons from Dan to Beershaba in one day; and when stretching out his hand against Jerusalem the Lord forbade him to strike the city, and the plague was stayed. An angel of the Lord made himself visible to Balaam's ass, stood with a drawn sword in his hand, and so affrighted the ass that it fell down under Balaam rather than approach the angel. An angel of the Lord appeared to Gideon, sitting under an oak, with a staff in his hand; and with this staff he touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes which Gideon set before him, and instantly they were consumed by fire: and the angel departed from his presence after delivering to him his message. While Elijah was sleeping under a juniper tree, an angel brought him a cake baked on coals, a cruse of water, and the angel touched him, awoke him, and exhorted him to eat. An angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 186,000 of the Assyrian army in one night. This is a fair specimen of the physical operations of angels on matter in their various errands and embassies in the affairs of men during the Mosaic institution.

Mr. Reed.—But might we not learn something of angelic influence and the services of the good angels from what is said of the devil and his angels? Would it not, therefore, be interesting and edifying if we should glance at the doings of Satan and his hosts of darkness?

Robert Fowler.—But little is directly said of Satan in the Old Testament. His agency is, however, distinctly and repeatedly stated; and the history of Job shows his power over the elements of this material system to be immense. The family of Job, his sons and daughters, his servants, his flocks and herds, and even his own person, attest the potency of Satan. And if we attend to what is said of his agency on the minds of men, we shall find the ancient records still more copious in details. Besides his assaults on our common parents we find him incessant in his malicious contrivances against our race. He long resisted the miracles of Moses by his sorceries in the land of Egypt. He stood up against Israel in the days of David, and "provoked him to number the people of God." (1 Chron. xxi. 1.) When Joshua the high priest stood before the angel of the Lord, Satan stood at his right hand to resist him. He sent forth a lying spirit to deceive Ahab by his false prophets. He corrupted all nations with idolatry, sorcery, witchcraft, necromancy, familiar spirits, &c. That supernatural power was by Satan imparted to mankind is evident from the law which says, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." God gave no such law against pretenders; the existence of a divine law on such a case is positive evidence of the fact of that case.

Mr. Reed.—Perhaps you have gone far enough into the detail. We have, then, abundant evidence that spirits good and evil have, in the affairs of our race, exercised a decided physical agency over nature, animate and inanimate, and have controlled the elements of matter as easily as the minds of men.

Father Goodal.—But there is yet one point which is not sufficiently corroborated and illustrated in the history of the Jewish age—that is the direct agency of angels, good and evil, on the minds of men.

Mr. Reed.—They have *talked* with men. All the influence, then, which language exercises over the human mind, is in the power of angels. In dreams, in visions, and in whispers they have communed with men. But in the New Testament this influence is more fully developed. And as I have seen Maria Goodal turning over the leaves of that volume, we shall call upon her to read all that is said of the services of angels in that volume.

Maria Goodal.—An angel appeared in the temple to Zecharias, intimated the birth of John, and smote Zecharias with deafness and dumbness because he believed not his word. The same angel, Gabriel, visited Mary and announced

to her the birth of the Saviour of the world. An angel appeared also to Joseph in a dream, and instructed him on all his scruples about retaining his wife, and communicated to him the name to be given to the son of Mary. An angel announced to the shepherds of Bethlehem the birth of Messiah the Lord; and a multitude of the heavenly host appeared with that angel, and sang on earth in the audience of the shepherds the high praises of Jehovah. An angel appears in a dream to Joseph, and advises him to flee into Egypt to save the infant Saviour from the jealousy of Herod; and an angel again appears to him in a dream, and advises his return to Judea after the demise of Herod. When Jesus had triumphed over the temptations of Satan, angels appeared to him in the desert and ministered to his wants. An angel moved the waters of Bethesda, and gave them power to cure the first afflicted body which was immersed in them. An angel appeared to Jesus in Gethsemane and strengthened him in his agony. Angels carried the spirit of Lazarus into Abraham's bosom. And angels waited on the holy women who first waited upon the tomb of the Saviour, rolled away the stone for them, and imparted to them counsel and comfort. An angel of the Lord spoke to Philip, and sent him to convert an Ethiopian officer. An angel intimated to Cornelius where he might find one who could make known to him the word of life. An angel, in answer to the prayers of the church, delivers Peter from the prison in which Herod had confined him. This angel irradiated the prison at midnight, smote Peter on the side, commanded him to rise, knocked off his chains, gave him direction about dressing himself, opened for him all the prison gates, and conducted him out into one of the streets of the city. An angel of the Lord smote Herod with worms, so that he instantly expired. An angel of the Lord appeared to Paul at sea, and foretold to him the fate of himself and his companions. An angel under the appearance of a Macedonian, approached Paul in a dream, and invited him into Macedonia.

To say nothing of what is written *of* angels in the New Testament, and not to go into the book of symbols, we may, I think, take these extracts as a fair sample of their services to our race.

Mr. Reed.—I am of opinion Maria has given us sufficient documents to furnish us with the means of estimating the variety and value of their ministrations; and if we add to these what is said *of* them by the Saviour and his Apostles, we shall not, I judge, err if we assign to them most, if not all those dispensations which are called special providences.

Mrs. Fowler.—But, brother Reed, were not these interpositions confined to the age of miracles, and have we any reason to think that they are *now* so employed in the affairs of men?

Mr. Reed.—This age of miracles, if we extend it to the times in which these services were rendered, is a very long age. It is an age of nearly 3000 years. From the days of Abraham till the end of the Revelation of John, they are always acting some part in the great drama of human existence.

Father Goodal.—I have often thought that if we had a history written by an inspired man of all the events of the last seventeen centuries, angels would figure in it as much as they do in the Acts of the Apostles. Of many a person it would be said he was stricken dead by an angel of the Lord; and of many another person it would be said he was called, sent, or delivered by an angel of the Lord.

Mr. Reed.—I perfectly concur with Father Goodal in this opinion: for angels generally work by means as God does.

Mrs. Reed.—I fear you will forget Mr. Williamson's question on the subject of the guardian angel.

Mr. Reed.—No, my dear, we are just coming to that. Jesus said the angels of little children do always look at the face of God; and though honored with a place in his temple, they wait on infants as their guardians; and if one angel is not sufficient for each person, we know that God has no lack of these agents. And Paul tells us they are ALL *ministering angels sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation.*

Mrs. Reed.—This is, however, confined to the heirs of salvation.

Mr. Reed.—Yes; on them they wait. But as God is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe, we have no reason to doubt that even wicked men are often preserved by them. But still the righteous only can expect their incessant guardian care—to them they are specially promised. Those in whose hearts the prince of darkness reigns, are unworthy of the companionship of the angels of God; and if for them they perform any services, it is with a reference to the righteous who are to be ultimately benefited by them.

Father Goodal.—In corroboration and illustration of all this, I will relate to you an anecdote, of the truth of which I am fully assured from a respectable minister among the Scotch Independents:—

On the estate of the Duke of A——, in Scotland, lived a country 'Squire, of considerable wealth and standing amongst the voluptuaries of his day. In a small cottage on his homestead lived a shepherd with his wife and ten children, whom the 'Squire kept constantly employed in his service, at the usual wages of the times. As the shepherd's family was large, and his wife feeble, in the best of times his labor and that of such of his children as could work, did no more than supply them with food and raiment of the simplest kind. But a scarcity occurred, and a dearth of provision ensued, so that to obtain food without raiment required every farthing that their combined exertions could procure. At last the dearth increasing, he had on one Saturday evening to go to bed supperless, without even the prospect of a meal before Monday. As his manner was, he spent an hour in the evening in instructing his children in the knowledge of God and their duties to him and all mankind, assuring them that if they trusted in God and obeyed his commandments, the Lord would never forsake them. In his prayer he expressed great gratitude to his heavenly Father for all his mercies, and prayed to him who feeds the birds of the air that he would give them their daily bread. Content and careless of to-morrow's fare, they retired to rest and slept soundly during the night.

To return to the 'Squire. On that day the 'Squire had made a great feast, and had invited many of his rich friends and jovial companions to partake with him; for them many a good shoulder and loin of roasted and boiled was prepared, and Cooks and Confectioners put in requisition all their science and art to minister to his pampered guests. But by some unforeseen casualty, not more than half of those that were bidden partook of the supper. After they had indulged themselves almost to satiety in the pleasures of sensuality, they retired to rest. But the 'Squire could not sleep. If he slumbered for a few minutes he was terrified with dreams, and the picture of the shepherd's family, honest, industrious, poor, and pious, being in extreme poverty, while he was rioting in luxury, haunted him like a spectre. Sleep absolutely forsook him; and calling his steward, he commanded him to take a sack of provisions, as much as he could carry on a horse, and to leave it quietly standing against the door of the shepherd's cottage, and never to tell that he had done it till the day of his death. The steward obeyed, and gathering up the loaves and hams which remained from the feast, he filled his sack, and set it up against the shepherd's door.

The morning came; the shepherd's family arose, and before they went out sang their morning song, and offered up their social prayers and thanksgivings. Immediately after the shepherd unbolted his door, when, to his astonishment and that of his family, the well packed sack fell into the floor. The gratitude and astonishment of the family may be better imagined than described. Suffice it to say, that whence it came continued a secret till the 'Squire's death, when, as an offset to some imputations against the memory of the deceased, his steward told this as a proof that he had at least done one good act in the whole course of his life.

EDITOR.

Virginia Doings.

Brother Campbell,

I AM anxious to hand down to posterity the characters upon the stage of action in our day, that they may take warning against the spirit and conduct of the leaders of this generation among us.

In the Religious Herald of the 7th June, a letter from A. Judson to "the Foreign Mission Association" of Hamilton, a paragraph of which contains so much truth, and is fully proved from observation around us, that I fear it will be lost to the next generation; I therefore have taken the liberty of trying to have it recorded in the Harbinger:—

"Beware of pride—not the pride of proud men, *but the pride of humble men—that secret pride*, which is apt to grow out of a consciousness that we are esteemed by the great and good. *This pride* sometimes eats out the vitals of religion before its existence is suspected. In order to check its operations, it may be well to remember HOW WE APPEAR IN THE SIGHT OF GOD, and how we should appear in the sight of our fellow-men, IF ALL WAS KNOWN.* ENDEAVOR TO LET ALL BE KNOWN. Confess your faults freely, and as publicly as circumstances will require or permit. When you have done something of which you are ashamed, and by which some one has been injured, (and what man is exempt?) be glad not only to make reparation, but improve the opportunity for subduing your pride."

This is the language of a Burmah Rabbi to his brethren in America. We shall soon see whether they will "*endeavor to let all be known*," and "*be glad not only to make reparation for the injury done to us, but to improve the opportunity of subduing their pride.*"

In the Herald of June 14th, 1833, we have a communication from Elder A. Broaddus, under the signature of "*Christianos*," upon "the Catholic controversy." When I read this epistle of his, I could but think of Paul's language in the first verse, 2d chap. of his letter to the Romans: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that *judgest:* for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things," &c. This is as clear as the sun in the firmament to all who have got clear of the smoke of Babylon. Permit me to take a concise review of his language, and prove with whom he is in company:—

1. He takes "great interest in the *Catholic controversy;* cannot help wishing that the Editor of the Herald had assigned more room to this department of his paper; that in a controversy of this sort he must own he feels much more agreeably interested, than in the existence of those intestine conflicts with which we have been too much disturbed." What shall we say of such language—a man that is opposed to controversy, if we believe him, when it comes near his door,

* *I have put this in large capitals, and some in small, and italicised some of the quotations from Elder Broaddus.*

but fond or pleased with it at a distance, when it does not say, "Thou art the man"? This is the way to keep in with the *majority;* and is this the way to "*endeavor to let all be known*" at home? I ask, Who has disturbed society? Let the King and Queen Decrees, the Dover Decree, and the test of fellowship question decide.

A larger portion of the Herald he wishes to be devoted to "the Catholic controversy," but not one inch for the restoration of the ancient gospel and order of things. How liberal he is at a distance from home, while his brethren are suffering under his proscriptions for advocating the New Testament.

2. "The aspect of popery presents so monstrous a perversion of the pure, simple, mild, and heavenly religion of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, that he cannot contemplate its existence without identifying it with the *land of darkness and shadow of death.*" Really, one would think that Elder Broaddus, from the foregoing language, was disposed to honor Jesus Christ and his Apostles above the sons of men; but how is it in practice?

3. "Every ray of light that pierces the moral gloom must be welcome to the friends of truth." Shall I believe the author of the above language means what he says or not? If this be the fact, how comes it to pass that this same man has solemnly decreed to exclude from his fellowship those who are laboring to present the light of truth, to remove the moral gloom that is visible upon the countenance of all sectarians; yea, upon his own countenance, as every unprejudiced man that runs may read, who attends his ministrations?

4. "The claim of Popery to establish the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and to interpret their meaning; and it is that sort of argument which reduces the *position assumed* to an *absurdity.*" I am unable to discover any difference in the *conclusion of the matter* in these United States, between Elder Broaddus' views to establish the authority of the Holy Scriptures in fundamentals and interpret their meaning, from that of the Romish church; except one undertakes to say what shall be the canonical Scriptures. But they both agree to exclude all men that will not take their views or explanations of the Scriptures, instead of the Scriptures themselves. Hear Mr. Broaddus: "Avowing the Bible as the only standard by which *our religious views are to be tried*—that a declaration be set forth, expressing our non-fellowship with those persons who may be found to deny or discard the Scripture truths, (AS WE UNDERSTAND THEM,) which may be specified in the said declaration. As to the mode of effecting this object, none more eligible presents itself to my mind, than *a delegation from each Association*, confining ourselves to the limits of our own state," &c. Here is a reverend Protestant leader, professing to "avow the Bible as the only standard by which *their religious views are to be tried*," in the same breath proposes what the Bible no where authorizes him or any other set of men to do—that is, to make *their views "a test of fellowship" among the disciples of Jesus Christ*, or exclude them *for not submitting to their views.* This is the very claim that Popery seeks to establish, and can do no more in these United

States without the consent of the people. Dr. Powers and Mr. Levens only ask that we would take their views, or rather explanations of the Bible and traditions, than the Bible itself.* Mr. Broaddus avows the Bible the standard by which his "*traditions and views are to be tried.*" But they must be the living infallible judges, witnesses, and jurymen *to try their own views.* For if any man dare dissent from them, he is anathematized by the same judges, witnesses, and jurymen.

Mr. Broaddus will no more take the New Testament alone as the bond of union and test of church fellowship with those that believe, repent, and are immersed for the remission of their sins, than Doctor Powers and Levens will—that is, his decrees prove he will not, and his conduct teaches us it shall be so.

5. "The church of Rome, [meaning, I suppose, the priesthood,] with the Pope at its head clothed with infallibility, has the exclusive right to pronounce what shall be considered valid scripture, and to *interpret or declare the true meaning of the sacred volume.*" Now let any man read his proposition *that the Associations should send a delegation to set forth a declaration of their views as a "test of church fellowship" in the state of Virginia,* which will assuredly consist of the priesthood, with some one in the Pope's chair, and say if their conclusions as to a dissentient will not be the same? May I not use his words? "It looks imposing enough, for it presents a very convenient way of settling all difficulty." This he knows from experience, when he signed the Dover Decree, and advised the Editors of the Herald not to let us be heard, though we have been condemned without witness, judge, or jury, except by our accusers, and then in our absence.

6. "Now I am an inquirer into the validity of this claim. How shall it be decided? Would a priest tell me straight off that I must be damned unless I believe and admit this claim? Not, I suppose, first without reasoning with me; and if he should, this would not *convince me.* WOULD HE HAVE ME PUT TO THE TORTURE TO ENFORCE THIS POINT ON ME? NEITHER WOULD THIS CONVINCE ME; and besides, in these United States he could not do it; (what thanks we owe for our privileges!) Well, then, there remains but one appeal—that is, to "the law and the testimony—to the Scriptures themselves." Where was this man's conscience if it did not smite him when he wrote the above sentence? Now we are inquirers into the validity of this exclusive right to set forth a declaration of their views as a "test of church fellowship among the disciples of Christ." Does he not by his decrees declare we are unworthy of the kingdom of heaven, unless we admit his traditions and views to be infallibly correct? Can such conduct "*convince* us?" Has he not actually resorted to the utmost stretch of his power to torture and destroy our Christian character

*Powers and Levens will drive the Protestants into the reformation we are contending for, or they will be defeated. Paul's rule of opening men's eyes and turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, is contained in 26th chapter, 20th to 23d verse of Acts.

and usefulness, which is dearer to us than life? Can the Pope do more in these United States? "What thanks do we, indeed, owe from our experience (under his hand) for our privileges!" Has he "appealed *to the law and the testimony—to the Scriptures themselves?*" Thus out of his own mouth he stands condemned before Dr. Brownlee's infallible rule and judge on order of controversy.

Now we are inquirers into the correctness of his views of "*total* depravity;" of his "natural ability and moral inability;" his "special influence in order to faith," or Calvinism dressed in silk stockings, gloves, and a beaver hat, and a strait-laced hyper's heart, with his steel stays on; or, to use his own words, "a man bound with a *hempen rope* or a *silken cord* is paralysed and proves him under the dominion of sin;" his "justification *alone* by faith, without obedience;" a "Christian's experience before obedience;" "forgiveness of sins without faith, repentance, and immersion;" of his keeping every Lord's day, when he only keeps it once in three months in any one church. His Saturday meetings for the discipline among the disciples; *his pastoral care of four churches*, leaving his own church to neglect the three Lord's days in a month, if not for eight in a year;* his right to decrees in councils and associations, without authority, and no notice to the accused, or liberty of defence; his six men from different parts ef the world to constitute an officer in a large and intelligent congregation; his theological school to make preachers, when the Scriptures have taught us the church is the school, and Christ is the teacher; His numbers of societies to make men Christians; lastly, his right to exclude men for obeying Jesus and his Apostles rather than men. Will he now "appeal to the law and to the testimony—to the Scriptures themselves," for his views and conduct? If so, we will meet him, and stand or fall by what they say. Not until he revokes his Dover Decrees, or nullifies them, do we desire any fellowship with him or the *immediate actors* in these unrighteous proceedings towards the disciples of Christ.

Lastly, "this claim is to be proved by the Scriptures. Then the Scriptures must be allowed to be valid, and we must be allowed the liberty of interpretation before we can decide on the claim—before we can recognize the authority of this said infallible Judge." Thus he condemns himself. Yours in the Lord,

T. M. HENLEY.

Everlasting Gospel--No. 4.

BABYLON is judged for her sorceries. She deceived the whole world. Under pretence of religion she has corrupted the waters of life, and got up an institution full of abominations. She has alienated

*The evidence of the Lord's day, and the eating of the loaf regularly when the disciples came together, stand and fall together; therefore, the day can not be kept as the Lord's day by his disciples, without breaking the loaf. See Broaddus' Beulah Reles in the Harbinger of April.

the ears and estranged the hearts of all her votaries from the voice of the Son of God. The simplicity of Christ is to her taste more insipid than water to a drunkard. Her institutions nourish and cherish every passion and feeling of the old man. They are directly or indirectly addressed to the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life. If the ranker weeds of gross vices must be kept down, the same passions will shoot up in other forms, and find room to blossom and bring forth other fruits of the flesh as acceptable to Satan as the grosser works of darkness. The more genteel sins of pharisaism, spiritual pride, contempt for good men, envy, strife, emulation, selfishness, avarice, and spiritual idolatry pollute the conscience and work the ruin of soul and body, as certainly, though sometimes not so quickly, as the crimes we denominate murder, adultery, drunkenness, revellings, and licentiousness. And has not Babylon the Great, and all her dependencies, engrossed within the pale of her ceremonies every thing which we call *the world*? In Italy where will you find the world out of the bosom of the Catholic church? In England where will you find the world out of the communion of the Episcopal church? In Scotland where is the world out of the pale of the Presbyterian church? And is it not the very constitution and policy of every Paidobaptist society to get every child of the flesh into the church, to make the doors of the church as wide as the gates of the world; and to enrol every child of Adam amongst the members of Christ—irrespective of personal faith or obedience? The ancient Christians were for eradicating the tares out of the wheat; the moderns are for sowing the tares among the wheat. What enchantments and sorceries have been practised by this insatiate harlot to allure the whole race of men into her measures! Their history of a thousand years does not tell all the tale.

But strong is the arm of the Lord who avenges her! When the hour of her judgment is come she shall be hurled into perdition as a millstone into the sea. The tares will be collected into bundels and given to the devouring flame, and she shall bewitch the nations no more.

But she is charged also with having "*shed the blood of prophets.*" Every one who presumes to punish men with civil pains and penalties for thinking for themselves, or for obeying the dictates of their own consciences, of whatever nature or kind that civil punishment may be, belongs to the bloody race who shed the blood of God's prophets. The principle is the same—the character is therefore the same; and all that is wanting is opportunity, and such a change in public opinion as to make it practicable. No man in his senses can imagine that amongst the religionists of this day there are fewer of this class in proportion to the aggregate than in the days of Richard I. or Henry III. But public sentiment is changed; and now slander, detraction, lying, and proscription have taken the place of jails, pillories, confiscations, and inquisitions. But if every one who hates his brother is in the sight of Heaven a murderer—every one who slanders and reproaches with his tongue is a persecutor. Whether the tongue, or the

arm, or the foot is used to injure the person or the character of a man, on account of his belief or his opinions, it matters not; the heart and the motive are the same.

It is not necessary to analyze the character of those motives to discover their consanguinity with those which led to the martyrdom of Abel. The great teacher places in one chapter with Cain all that had caused a tear or a drop of blood to flow for the sake of conscience. The motive which shed the blood of righteous Abel, and that which shed the blood of the son of Barachias, was the same. His doctrine is, he that is unjust in little is unjust in much; and with us it is a maxim that he who steals a cent is a *thief* as well as he who steals a thousand pounds. It is also a maxim that character is dearer than life; that a good name is better than riches; and that

> "He that steals my purse steals trash;
> 'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands.
> But he that filches from me my good name,
> Takes that from me which not enriches him,
> And makes me poor indeed!"

"*The blood of prophets!*" Precious blood! The saints in God's sight are most precious. One of them is worth more than all the gold, silver, and precious stones with which our globe abounds—worth more than our globe itself and all its varied riches. He that touches them, touches the apple of his eye, and he will in his own time show that the traducers and persecutors of his people are his enemies. In the day of his vengeance he will recompence all the blood of his saints upon the heads of them who caused it to be shed, or were partakers of their deeds. "Rejoice over her, you holy Apostles and Prophets, for God has avenged you on her!" The Apostles and Prophets are commanded to rejoice in the proclamation of the everlasting gospel, because God has judged this great harlot, and avenged their sufferings upon her head. But how did the Apostles and Prophets suffer by this mother of every abomination? Were they ever under her ban or her anathemas? Only in their doctrine and in their brethren who acted upon their testimony. These two witnesses for God have prophesied long in sackcloth and ashes. The Prophets and Apostles have been traduced, dethroned, and persecuted again and again to death in the persons of them who would have restored and honored them. Hence now, when taken up to heaven after their long sufferings—at the time of this judgment the order emanates from high authority, "Rejoice over her, you holy Apostles and Prophets, for God has avenged you on her!"

But the Apostles and Prophets now live on earth only in the persons of them who are governed by their testimony—not in all who profess to believe them; for of these many have fallen by intemperance, licentiousness, duelling, &c. and surely the Apostles and Prophets are not implicated in their catastrophe. Yet parents do not more certainly live in the persons of their children, than do the Apostles in the persons and characters of all who through them derive life from the Messiah, or believe on and obey him through their testimony.

Every indignity offered to their doctrine or their institutions, found in whose life or in whose conduct soever they may be, is opposed to them, and to him that sent them. "He that receives you receives me, and he that rejects you rejects me," says the Great Prophet. There will be joy in heaven and earth at the proclamation of the angel of this everlasting good news, that all the wrongs done to Prophets and Apostles, to all the saints for adhering to their testimony, shall be redressed and avenged upon the children of them who had caused these witnesses to prophesy so many years in sackcloth and ashes.

EDITOR.

Professor Stuart on the Mode of Baptism.

NO. II.

THE secondary meanings of *bapto* and *baptizo*, in classic use, adduced by our laborious author, are the following. We quote his own words:—

"2. The verb *bapto* means *to plunge* or *thrust* into any thing that is solid, but permeable; *to plunge in* so as to cover or enclose the thing plunged.

3. The verb *bapto* only is employed, in order to convey the meaning, *to dip out, to dip up*, by plunging a vessel into a liquid and drawing it up.

4. The verb *bapto* only, (and its derivatives in point of form,) signifies *to tinge, dye*, or *color*.

No doubt then can remain, that the word *bapto* means *to tinge*, or *color;* and in this respect it seems plainly to differ from *baptizo*. I find no instance in which the latter is employed in this way. There may be some, which have escaped the extensive search that I have made. But until I see them produced I must believe that the sense of *tinging* is appropriated only to *bapto*, and to its kindred words in respect to form. I am aware that Passow assigns to *baptistes* the meaning of *baptizer, plunger*, and *dyer;* but of the last meaning I must now doubt, until some examples are produced. All other words kindred to *baptistes*, (kindred in form, as coming from *baptizo*,) are destitute of such a sense as that of *dyeing* or *coloring*, according to Passow's own statement.

If the conclusion just stated be correct, then we can see that there exists the like difference between the actual usage of *bapto* and *baptizo*, as exists between many other verbs which have the same relation in respect to form, and where the ending in *-ζω* has not the sense of a *frequentative*. The reader by looking back to the statement made above (p. 294 sq.) in relation to this subject, may now satisfy himself still further, that *buptizo* is *not* a frequentative. I have found no instance in which this sense is apparent, so far as the nature of the verb itself is concerned.

5. The word *baptizo* means *to overwhelm*, literally and figuratively, in a variety of ways.

6. *Bapto* is also employed in the sense *to smear, to bathe*, by the application of liquid to the surface, &c.

7. A shade of meaning kindred to the above, viz. *to wash*, i. e. to cleanse by the use of water, is sometimes attached to the word *bapto* in the classics."

Next let us hear him on the Septuagint and Apocrypha signification of *baptizo;* for the Professor is determined to lay before us all the uses of these words.—

"1. The verb *bapto* signifies *to plunge, immerse, dip in.*

In like manner *baptizo* takes the same signification.

2 Kings v. 14. And Naaman went down, and *plunged himself* seven times into the river. The prophet Elisha had said, *Wash thyself* seven times in the Jordan. 2 Kings v. 10.

2. To *smear over* or *moisten* by dipping in; in which sense I find *bapto* only employed.

3. *To overwhelm;* where *baptizo* is used. Of this I find but one example; and in that the word is used in a figurative way.

Isa. xxi. 4. My iniquity *overwhelms* me; where the Hebrew has *to terrify*, &c.

4. Of the sense of *tinging* or *coloring*, given to *bapto*, I find only one example; and here the reading is various and contested.

5. *To wash, cleanse by water;* where *baptizo* is used.

6. *To moisten, wet, bedew;* where *bapto* is used.

Meaning of the words *bapto*, *baptizo*, and their derivatives in the New Testament, when not applied to the rite of baptism:—

1. BAPTO.

1. *To dip.*

2. *To dye.*

2. BAPTIZO.

1. *To wash*, in the literal sense.

2. But *baptizo* and *baptisma* have, in a few cases, a *figurative* sense, which deserves a particular consideration.

Luke xii. 5. *I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!* That is, I am about to be *overwhelmed* with sufferings, and I am greatly distressed with the prospect of them.

So the classic usage: To overwhelm with misfortune; to overwhelm with taxes—with wine—with questions—with debt—with excessive labor, &c. &c.

3. There is another *figurative* use of *baptizo*, allied in some respects to the preceding, but distinguished from it in the mode of its application. I mean that usage of the word which employs it to designate the idea of *copious affusion* or *effusion*, in a figurative manner. The basis of this usage is very plainly to be found in the designation by *baptizo* of the idea of *overwhelming*, i. e. of surrounding on all sides with fluid. *Copious affusion* or *effusion* is kindred to this; and very obviously, the word which designates the preceding idea, may also designate these meanings.

E. g. Matth. iii. 11. *He shall* BAPTIZE *you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;* i. e. he will make a copious effusion of his Spirit upon a part of you; and another part, viz. the finally unbelieving and impenitent, he will surround with flames, or plunge into the flames."

Thus the reader may see, from all the research of this learned Paidobaptist, that in no use, sacred or profane, of these words, are they ever used for *sprinkling* or *pouring*.

We have, then, all authority for translating these words *to dip*, *to immerse*—none for *sprinkle* or to *pour*. We have all divine authority for *immersion*—none for *sprinkling* or *pouring*.

After all this, I am aware the reader will be curious to know how our learned essayist essays *to keep out of the water*.

With the utmost scrupulosity and sincerity, the Professor deliberately asks the following question:—

"Do *baptizo* and its derivates, when applied to designate the *rite of baptism*, necessarily imply that this rite was performed by *immersion* of the whole person?"

To cast light upon this dark subject—(*dark*, indeed, after the united testimony of all sacred and profane antiquity, against sprinkling and pouring, and in favor of immersion)—it is now to be gravely discuss-

ed whether, after all, we can ever be certain, morally certain, infallibly certain, that this "*rite*" was not sometimes, perchance, performed by sprinkling or pouring. Or suppose it can never be proved that it was ever performed by sprinkling, pouring, or smearing, still it is worthy to inquire, and with all logical exactness, whether this "*rite* was performed by immersion of the whole person?"

The Professor, to settle this very difficult matter, proposes the following method:—

"There are many different ways in which light may be cast upon the ground of this inquiry:—

I. We may contemplate the proper force and signification of the word itself, as determined by the *usus loquendi* in general.

II. We may examine the circumstances which attended the administration of this rite, and see whether they cast any light upon the *manner* of the rite itself.

III. We may investigate the early history of the rite, and see whether it already existed in the Jewish church, at the time when John the Baptist made his appearance; and if so, what was the manner of it among the Jews, and whether John or Jesus made any change in this manner.

IV. We may investigate the subsequent history of the rite, in the early ages of the Christian church, and see what mode of baptizing was practised by the churches in general.

V. When all this is done, and the *mode* is philologically and historically exhibited or established, we may then make the inquiry whether any particular mode of applying water in baptism is essential to the ordinance, and obligatory upon the churches of Christ at the present day."

Now it may be possible to raise a doubt on some one or other of these five points; and if only one plausible doubt can be raised, the Paidoes will cleave to that doubt as to the shelter of a great rock in a weary land! Our Professor, also *professionally* on the same side with them, it will be necessary to examine this question very closely. On the first point he concludes, p. 317:—

"Setting aside this, then, for a moment, we may say, in all other cases in the New Testament, the *mode* of baptism is left undetermined by the original Greek, so far as the language itself is concerned, unless it is necessarily implied by the word *baptizo;* for in all other cases, only *the element by which,* not *the mode in which* baptism is performed, is designated by the sacred writers.

Now as neither *en*, nor *ek*, nor *apo*, nor *eis*, nor any verb or preposition in the language can be urged, which once and forever signifies the same thing; it is not absolutely certain from the prepositions that any one ever went down into the water. Well, unless *baptizo* necessarily and forever implies the act of immersion beyond the possibility of doubt, in any case whatever—then it is again in the clouds. Well, now, our candid author will go this far on this point:—

"The answer to the above questions which I feel philologically compelled to give, is, that the probability that *baptizo* implies *immersion*, is very considerable, and on the whole a predominant one; but it does not still amount to certainty. Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint show, that *washing and copious affusion* are sometimes signified by this word. Consequently, the rite of baptism may have been performed in one of these ways, although it is designated by the word *baptizo*. Whether in fact it was so, then, seems to be left for inquiry, from other evidence than that which the word itself necessarily affords."

Well, now, the Professor is out to sea again. He is in quest of some other port. Neither the uniformity of the verb or preposition will exclude all possibility of doubt, and therefore he finds the subject open to farther inquiry. But before he leaves this point he thinks it due to the whole public, to state the 'PROBABILITY' that *immerse* is fairly implied in the force of the word. This was candid. He says, p. 318:—

"On the whole, however, the probability seems to be in favor of the idea of *immersion*, when we argue simply *ex vi termini*, i. e. merely from the force of the words or expressions in themselves considered."

But we shall wait on the Professor again.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

Extracts from Letters.

FORCE OF TRUTH.

WE congratulate our brother Butler for the favor bestowed upon him. He has certainly found a pearl of great value, and he knows how to appreciate it! If the Lord should now honor him, by permitting him to suffer a good deal of shame *for his name*, how much might he rejoice! I thank the Lord for the accession of this talented brother to the good cause. The salvation and happiness of every man is alike important in itself; but when we see men of wealth, talent, and standing in society, cordially embrace the ancient institutions, and devote themselves to their spread and prevalence in the world, with all their powers, we have reason for more joy and gratitude because of the means of doing good which the Lord has bestowed on them. May the Lord make the life and labors of this much esteemed brother a blessing—a great blessing to many!——*Ed.*

CARLOWSVILLE, *Alabama*, May 27, 1833.

Brother Campbell,

AFTER a prayerful and deliberate examination of Scripture facts, as arranged and developed in your voluminous compositions, and the attendant reasons for such developments, I am necessarily and satisfactorily brought to acknowledge the high benefits which their truths have afforded me.

Before God, angels, and men, I have no other motive in the espousal of *the ancient order of things*, as contended for by you in your labors of love, than the honor of my King, the benefit of others, and peace of my own soul. I have not come to a conclusion upon the merits of your writings, without a minute and critical examination of them—with my Bible (blessed book!) before me, and my God in my mind. I assure you, that in the examination of your views, I was not hurried forward to a favorable conclusion by any prepossessions either for you or them. No; far from it. The first circumstance which led me to an investigation of your writings, was a *sui generis* encomium passed upon your debate with Mr. Walker, by a brother Baker of Alabama.

He remarked to me that he had seen a blow at the root of infant sprinkling, by Alexander Campbell, who, he was sorry to learn, was a schismatic; "but," said he, "if they were the sentiments of the devil, they are true."

The next information was from a Presbyterian preacher, who seemed to be agitated at the very mention of your name, (though I did not see the finger, yet I knew the pigeon was touched from the fluttering of its wings,) who deposed and said, that "one Alexander Campbell, an evil doer, was turning the Baptist world upside down." He did not even add, that "if it be of the Lord it will prosper."

The next information was from sundry witnesses in Kentucky, in 1828, all of whom deposed—some against, and many for the accused.

In October, 1828, I returned to Alabama, and for two successive years, under a misguided zeal for my creed, (nature, hush thy murmurings, for it is truth!) I prayed the Lord's anathemas upon you, for I thought you loved him not. But in reflecting upon my conduct toward you, I felt occasionally a compunction of heart; and my only quietus was, that old brethren, who professed to be guided by charity, (darling attribute!) emitted the same. I finally examined an old adage, which was this, that "it was the office of ignorant and corrupt men to censure without evidence." At once I determined to read your views for myself. I have now to conclude by adding, that, in my opinion, he who reads them most will esteem them highest.

I must shove a thousand things out of my way, and sign myself your brother in the hope of immortality,

JAMES A. BUTLER.

CALAWAY COUNTY, Mo. April 17, 1833.

Brother Campbell,

THE reformation is making considerable progress in this western part of the union. I have very lately commenced pleading it, and have had much success. Among the number I have lately baptized were six Paidoes. This day I have immersed five, one of whom is an intelligent young man, a public speaker in the Methodist church, who will be a useful proclaimer of the gospel. Another was a man of 77 years of age. When I was introduced to this old man I asked him if he had embraced the gospel. He said he had not. I then requested his reasons. He said he had desired the favor of the Lord for many years; but he was resting until God would make him a Christian, and then he would obey. I referred him to the testimony, and then requested him to obey; when he replied, "Sir, I will with all my heart." He then submitted to immersion, and went his way truly rejoicing.

HENRY THOMAS.

PIKE COUNTY, Mo. May 19, 1833.

THE good cause we plead progresses here better than I anticipated. Opposition runs high here at this time. We came out of Babylon last February, and constituted with ten members; now our number is twenty-three. I had a son and daughter immersed for the remission of sins. There was one more immersed, and we expect some more to obey soon. There are five churches within the bounds of twenty miles of this place; one on the West Fork of Cuiver, Montgomery county; one at Frankfort, in this county; Ramsey's Creek and Troy, each one; which are all living in peace and harmony.

I would give you a history of the proceedings of the opposition here, but it is so much like that which has been pressing to you from every quarter, that I think it unnecessary at this time. We need public teachers here. There are but four living in the above bounds.

E. MARTIN.

Callaway County, Mo. May 26, 1833.

Brother Campbell,

I HAVE your Christian Baptist and a few numbers of the Millennial Harbinger; also, your Debates with Owen and M'Calla, and have read them with peculiar delight. I have been more instructed in the Christian religion by them than by any other composition of human origin. I have laid aside my "Discipline," to which I have been a slave for four years, and have vowed allegiance to the King of kings and Lord of lords. Seven of us have been immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of our sins, and are trying to exhibit the primitive order of Christianity. We expect a considerable increase.

GREENUP JACKMAN.

Mount Gilead, Ohio, May 26, 1833.

Dear Brother—THE good work of converting souls to the gospel of the Son of God is still progressing among us, and the sectarians are greatly discouraged in this place. The disciples are all alive to the great concerns of eternal life. The ancient gospel was first preached in this place by your unworthy servant, who was the first that was called in this place of the ancient order; but thanks be to God who giveth the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Our number is now very considerable. We have several churches in this county, some of them consisting of one hundred members. Since I first came here I have been preaching constantly, although much debilitated by sickness.

WILLIAM DOWLING.

Richland County, Ohio, June 11, 1833.

A GREAT revival has taken place with us. Twenty-four were buried in baptism in one day; fourteen in another part of the county within four weeks, and three last first day in Mansfield.

G. D. LOWRY.

Jefferson County, Ky. May 31, 1833.

THE reformation is progressing rather slow at this time amongst us; one of my neighbors, however, upwards of 70 years of age, was immersed last evening. He came out of the water rejoicing in the Lord, and with trembling limbs and voice, exhorted the youth to turn to the Lord.

I think it my duty to notify you that the reply in the April number (which I had the opportunity to see) to Mr. Grew is thought well of by all amongst us that I have heard speak of it. I find there are some things called "speculations" on that subject, which I consider to be important practical truths.—Dear brother, I do hope you will stand firm to your purpose, never to derogate aught from the glory and dignity of our Almighty Lord.*

B. ALLEN.

---

*Brother Fleming, for whom I entertain a very high opinion, thinks very differently of said letter; and has accordingly addressed to me, through the the Christian Messenger, a letter on the subject. But if the brethren who have directly or indirectly contributed to the growth or production of this philosophy, called Arianism, will only allow us to explain ourselves, and why our opposers wrongfully accuse us of this error, we will assure them we have no idea of renewing or waging again the logomachies of former days, and apprehend that no Christian effort or interest will suffer by it.

Editor.

LEXINGTON, Ky. June 1, 1833.

I WISH I could give you the outlines of the great Kentucky Baptist Convention, which closed in this place on Monday last. It was a poor effort. About 16 or 20 preachers attended. Wilson of Elkton may be placed first; Mr. Vaughn of Mason, second; Mr. Noel of Frankfort, third; and then comes George Waller, J. B. Smith, and about a dozen more of what may be justly termed fourth-rate of this assembly; but of such an assembly of Baptists as Kentucky once could bring out, these last would be about ninth and tenth rate.

P. M.

LANCASTER, Ky. June 1, 1833.

THE travelling brethren have been with us here; and although the Regular Baptists barred and locked their doors against them, the word of the Lord prevails mightily through their instrumentality. There were twenty added at one place; one of them a Presbyterian lady, the wife of an Elder of that church. There was also a young lady came forward and requested to be immersed; but her brother-in-law, who was a Regular, forbid it, and prevented her from going to meeting again. *Such opposition, perhaps, is unheard of in any country.*

ELIZABETH M. JENNINGS.

GEORGETOWN, Ky. June 10, 1833.

Dear brother Campbell,

ALTHOUGH personally unknown to you, it will no doubt be gratifying to you to hear that the principles of reformation are succeeding here beyond the most sanguine anticipations of its friends. On the last Lord's day in May brothers Stone and Johnson had a meeting at Dry Run meeting house. One made the good confession in the evening of the same day. Brother Johnson and myself held a meeting at brother William Offutt's, at which four more confessed the Saviour. On the Wednesday evening following brother Johnson had another meeting at Dry Run meeting house, when six more confessed. On yesterday brother S. G. Marshall held a meeting at brother Munson's, eight miles north of this place, when five more confessed. Yesterday evening brothers Johnson, Marshall, and myself held a meeting six miles north of this: when an invitation was given, eleven more made the confession. Thus you see in one week twenty-seven persons, all of the first character and standing, have added to their faith courage to make the most honorable confession that was ever made by mortal man. I never witnessed such a scene as I saw yesterday evening: Say 150 of warm and bold disciples, besides 200 spectators, and scarcely a dry eye to be seen. We continue the meetings this week, and how many more will turn their backs upon the world remains yet to be seen. We expect a goodly number more.

Your debate with Owen was placed in my hands by brother J. T. Johnson, as I lived his neighbor, with a request that I should give it an attentive perusal. I did so; and the result was, that I became a firm believer in the Christian religion; for before that debate I had never heard from any man the evidences upon which the religion offered to the world by our Saviour was predicated. I was immersed by brother Johnson in October last, and in a short time after commenced public speaking all the spare time that I could command from my mercantile pursuits. I design situating myself, if spared, so that I can give the whole of my time to the cause of him who died that I might live, and live eternally. I have had the satisfaction of seeing many of my young friends coming into the kingdom on earth, in order to a preparation for the ultimate kingdom of glory. And whatever abuse others may heap upon you, I am indebted to your labors for my faith in the only Saviour of men.

BENJAMIN W. FINNELL.

GEORGETOWN, Ky. June 29, 1833.

Brother Campbell—SINCE I last wrote you we have had a severe visitation from the cholera. It has disappeared for some days in town, but still ravages the country. I had no idea of its awful march until we had a practical demonstration. It produced a prodigious panic, but our citizens bore it with considerable fortitude. It taught me one thing clearly—that infidelity cannot brave it out. There was a yielding disposition, on all hands, to the Christian's hope. Just before it broke out we had commenced vigorous operations in the county in regard to the progress of the gospel. The accessions commenced in considerable numbers, and it has continued until we have immersed (in this county and town) about one hundred and fifty. The good cause is still progressing; it has surpassed my expectations.

I saw many cases of the cholera in town. I kept in good health, but much exhausted, until about the time of its disappearance. I was visited by a severe bilious attack, and have not yet recovered. Thank the Lord for his mercies, I have enjoyed comfortable times in sickness. My hope is in heaven.

J. T. JOHNSON.

HOLMES COUNTY, Mi. April 2, 1833.

THERE are a few of us even here in Holmes county, that have dared to take up the Bible, and start in search of the street that leads out of Babylon. The bombshells of all parties are hurled at our devoted heads. Although young in the true faith and weak in the Scriptures, and possessing but one talent, yet I have had the pleasure of immersing seven candidates for Emanuel's realms of bliss and glory. There is one dear old Baptist has joined us. We now muster nine members, who meet on the Lord's day to praise, pray, and and break the loaf. Our sky is dark and overcast with a mighty cloud of opposition, gainsaying, ridicule, &c. Some say it is blasphemy for any man to administer baptism or the Lord's supper without having been ordained and commissioned from on high.

R. D. CRESSWELL.

FOUNTAIN COUNTY, Ia. April 18, 1833.

AS it has been but a few years since our country was the habitation of savage men and wild beasts, consequently the present population that migrated hither brought with them their sectarian peculiarities; accordingly, some two or three Baptist churches were constituted, and probably as many or more of the Christian order, so called. With some Presbyterians and Methodists there was, however, but little religious excitement before the appearance of the Harbinger. Since then the principles of reform have been cordially received by a goodly number of the Christian order, and some of their preaching brethren have turned out proclaimers. An effort has been made in two of those churches in this vicinity to come into the order of the New Testament; but has proved as yet rather unsuccessful. Brother Watson Clark, who travelled considerably last summer, proclaiming the word, had an appointment at a school house in the neighborhood on the last Lord's day in October last; and after a discourse of some length, adapted to the occasion, he made propositions to a few disciples present, that all who were willing to unite with him and take the New Testament as their rule of life and christian practice, would seat themselves on a seat which he pointed out. Accordingly six or seven took their seats. He then appointed a meeting at his own house on the next Lord's day for the purpose of breaking bread; when an opportunity was offered, and I had the pleasure of confessing and obeying the Lord. Four other persons offered themselves, and were received by the brethren. On the next Lord's day two females were immersed; and on the following, one; and we have had an accession of one disciple since. We now number seven males and nine females. On the second Lord's day in January we appointed elders and deacons; and our manner of worship is as follows:—After singing and prayer, one of the brethren reads a portion of three or four chapters in the common version,

and another reads the same in the new, of which we have but one copy, belonging to brother Clark. We have to encounter some perverse opposition from the Baptists and those of the Christian order opposed to reform.

DAVID ANDERSON.

Geneva, Ill. April 22, 1833.

I THINK I omitted to inform you of a congregation being organized in Sweet's Prairie, Morgan county, about the first of February, of eighteen members. They now number twenty-six. Four united with them yesterday—two from the United Baptists, and two by confession. More from the Baptists are expected soon. Great unanimity prevails among the disciples, and I think their prospect of success very flattering. Very few, if any of them, have read your works, consequently they are not "Campbellites." They learn the *doctrine* from the Book. May the Lord prosper them!

H. A. CYRUS.

Nicholasville, Ky. 24, 1833.

WE have abundant encouragement here as a church, and for each and every Christian to be up and doing. During the last ten days we immersed fourteen for remission; amongst them there were a Presbyterian elder and his lady, and two Methodists. The sects are all up in arms, and freely anathematizing the turncoats. On the 15th of May last I was invited by some of the brethren of Mount Pleasant Church, 6 miles from this place, where Edmund Waller, of New Testament *blazing* memory, has preached and ruled for many years, to be present with them while organizing themselves into a church upon the word of God. There were only five present who put themselves under the yoke. On the second Lord's day in this month I was with them again. Present, bro. John Smith and William Morton. The meeting lasted three days; at which time sixteen were added—two by confession—the balance from that and other churches. They are now twenty-one strong. Edmund and his brethren, with their usual violence, barred up the doors and windows; and on Saturday, when I was about addressing the people, standing upon the door sill, I was ordered not to do so in the lot; but knowing my privileges, I proceeded with my discourse. They use great violence. There was a large concourse of people at the last named meeting. They took an humble seat upon the grass, and there we spread a cloth, and broke the loaf upon the green; and I do not know that I ever saw more solemnity. Their violence is aiding us much; and Edmund and his brethren are outrageously mad. But what has increased their mortification, is the fact, that we immersed here last week one of the sons of the most violent and prominent members, with his wife, which they greatly lament; and the son himself was a great opposer until a few days before he obeyed.

We have awful times with us by reason of the *Cholera*. In Lexington from 3 to 500 have fallen victims to it; and there yet continues to die from 3 to 10 a-day. Lancaster, 22 miles from us, has been deserted, and about 20 dead. Millersburg and Paris, the same way. As for ourselves the Lord has so far greatly favored us. There has been but one death, and 6 or 7 cases. The people appear solemn as death, and many turning to the Lord. Since the first of May we have immersed here, and in this neighborhood, upwards of 20 persons. O that people would reform from their evil ways and turn to God! May the Lord save and bless you!

G. W. ELLEY.

Brother *Walter Scott* has planted, and the Lord has made to grow up a congregation of *one hundred and four members*, in Carthage, Hamilton county, Ohio—that being now the immediate theatre of his domestic labors. The conversions in that place have been not only numerous for the time, but many of them extraordinary; so much so, that a village not long since distinguished for swearing, gambling, drunkenness, debate, fighting, and petty legal prosecu.

tions, is now filled with the melody of praise, and abounds in good order, joy, and thanksgivings to the Lord!——*Ed.*

☞From different letters from Hagerstown, Maryland, we learn, with great satisfaction, that, under the labors of brother *Philip G. Young*, of this vicinity, and other brethren, a church, of from forty to fifty members, has recently grown up in that place. Under date of the 4th ult. brother Young says, "The work of the Lord is progressing here. Several have been immersed since I wrote you. The people are very solicitous to know when you are coming here." ☞If the Lord will, we hope to see the brethren on our way going to, or returning from the East, during the current season—cannot yet say on what day.——*Ed.*

Converting Power.

WELLSBURG, July 5, 1833.

Dear Sir,

ON reading your reply to my last, it first occurred to me that I would not answer you until I have finished my essay on a special providence; but I have concluded that it will be more gratifying to your readers for me to reply to any of your remarks on my views, as you may from time to time offer them, in separate letter.

I am sorry you attempt to reconcile *all* you have said in your essay on the Holy Spirit, with what you now admit in the way of a special providence.

Many things in your essay are calculated to expose the folly of *mysticism*, and the *constraining* agency contended for by Antinomians; but some things there stated are subversive of piety, if carried into practice, and, as I have said, calculated to "damp our devotions."

You say, "All the converting power of the Holy Spirit is in the word." This you deem "a proposition of much importance in this age." "By power," you say, you "mean *moral* power, or *converting* power." I suppose you will, of course, admit any thing to be converting power which influences a sinner to break off from his sins, and turn to God. Now, suppose that after I learn from reading the Bible, that I should break off from stealing, but do not—an angel makes an impression on my mind—I am alarmed, and quit the evil practice—is not this something done for me out of the word? Here is *power not in the word.* Again, supposing a good man is overwhelmed with a deadly anguish, and, like his agonizing Lord, falls prostrate and prays to his heavenly Father; an angel is sent to strengthen him—*not visibly*, but by *invisible* agency—he rises above his temptation—is not this a power above the word, and out of it? And, my dear sir, what does our blessed Master teach us when he commands us to say, "Abandon us not to temptation," if there is no power to be expected out of the word?

Is not angelic aid, which you admit, something *"out of the word"*? And if this kind of ministry in the government of the world was to cease, should we be in as favorable a situation in relation to our salvation as what we now are, notwithstanding the written word should be left? But you say you "do not confine special interpositions to the ministry of angels." Well, supposing that God, who is every where present, should give us assistance, similar to that which you say angels give—should we not have a *"power*, out of the word"' and does not prayer suppose it? or, as Paley says, *"that the Deity is intimate with our minds?"*

That you may save your favorite definition—that *all the converting power is in the word*, and *that word must be spoken or written*, you attempt to prove that God cannot give us ideas or knowledge only by "words or signs," and ask "if there be any other way of revealing a character not submitted to our senses, you wish to be be informed of it." I take not on me to determine *all* the ways

by which God can give me ideas or assistance in the work of my salvation. The manner in which the Spirit operated in the days of our Master, was admitted by him to be a mystery. I do not know that he has explained it. Nearly two thousand years have rolled away since that time, but our Lockes and Paleys, Reeds and Stewarts, after all their researches into mind, tell us, "The source of thought is unknown"—of course a foreign agent may act on our minds through mediums unknown to us.

Are you certain that God always employed signs or words in communicating his will to his Son? I ask you, my dear sir, for the proof; and if you cannot give it, I hope you will not turn Nicodemus, and deny the fact. In speaking of the manner in which *good* and *evil* angels influence us, you say it is by assuming some form—"the form of a man—of any creature—of a thought." That angels have assumed the form of men is not new to me; but that they should assume the form of a '*thought* or *word*,' is to me *a bran new idea*. I have heard of the *quality* of thoughts, but this is the first time I ever heard of their *form*. This, my dear sir, must be "a slip of the pen," to borrow the words of the Jews in their reply to Voltaire.

However, you admit it to be "certain" that angels influence us, and attempt to save your *favorite position* by adverting to the history of the Fall. The tempter, you say, was a philosopher, and understood our nature. Whether he then believed your philosophy about mind, or not, I will not undertake to determine—if he did, I venture to say he is now a better philosopher than he was then; for we are not informed that he used any words or signs when he tempted Judas or Peter. Because he sometimes employed words or signs in tempting men, we should not infer he always does. God once employed the tongue of an ass to rebuke a backslidden prophet: but it would be bad logic to conclude he has no other way of administering rebuke.

How God moves physical bodies is mysterious to me; indeed, I have never been able to understand how one body moves another—how the magnet moves the needle. A Cartisian philosopher, like my good friend A. Campbell, dives into the mystery at once, and tells us of a magnetic effluvia which passes from the magnet to the needle; but a Newtonian philosopher asks for proof, and can find none—he rejects it as a mere hypothesis—just as I do your philosophy of mind, when you undertake to limit the mode of the Spirit's operation by your conceptions. Some of the ancient philosophers denied the possibility of motion, because they could not explain how one body moves another; and Mr. Hume declares that the power of the mind to move the body at its will, is as incomprehensible as the creation of the world out of nothing.

I was not much surprized when I heard some of your younger brethren in the ministry advance such bold propositions in the pulpit. It is quite common for us to be bold and confident when young and ardent—and to be fond of our sectarian peculiarities. But that *you*, my dear sir, should affirm that God's Spirit can aid us in the work of salvation only by *signs* and *words*, does surprize me not a little—or that you should undertake to explain the *manner* of the Spirit's operations.

It has, however, taught me a valuable lesson, I think I shall never forget—your unsuccessful attempt to explain the *manner* of spiritual communications—your angel attempting to assume the *form* of a *thought* or a *word*, will be always present to my recollection, and, like the flaming sword placed to guard the Tree of Life, will keep me away from such dangerous and *interdicted ground*.

You say that "the Calvinist and Arminian agree, that some *sovereign non-descript independent* spiritual or special agency is necessary to make the word of God credible, or to enable every sinner to believe it—that agreeing in this point, all the rest is but a war of words." That Calvinists and Arminians agree that *special* and *spiritual* aid are necessary in the work of salvation, I believe is known to all the world. They agree that we must have a power, or assistance *out of the word*, and accordingly pray for it. But, my dear sir, you cannot be ignorant that they differ in their views of *moral ability* and *spiritual influence*. The Calvinist believes that we are so depraved in consequence of

Adam's fall, that we cannot believe *savingly* until we receive what he calls the special *call*. The Arminian believes that by virtue of the remedial scheme of Christianity, all men are at *all times* in possession of a power to believe—to co-operate with the system of grace in working out our salvation. Now, my dear sir, you can certainly distinguish between a power to do a thing without any foreign aid, and a power to co-operate with aid, when offered.

The following quotations from eminent writers will illustrate the distinction, and give you my views:—Dr. *Paley*. "There is a way of considering the subject of special influence, as well as *a want of considering it*, which lay it open to misconception. One difficulty which has struck the minds of some is, that the doctrine of an influencing spirit, and the importance of this influence to human salvation, is an arbitrary system, making every thing to depend not upon onrselves, nor upon any exertions of our own, but upon the gift of the Spirit. The Doctor acknowledges that the doctrine is *mysterious*, but he shows that *it is not arbitrary in its origin, its degrees, or final success. It is not arbitrary in its origin*, for we read it is given to prayer: "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those that ask it"—but whether we *will ask it or not depends on ourselves.* But it will be asked, Is not the very *first touch* of true religion upon the soul, *sometimes*, at least, the action of the Holy Spirit? This, therefore, must be prior to our praying for it; and so it may be, and not yet be *arbitrarily* given. The religious states of the human soul hre exceedingly various: amongst others there is a state in which there may be good latent disposition, suitable faculties for religion—yet no religion. In such a state the *spark* only is wanting; but that state of heart and mind upon which the effect was to be produced, might still be the result of *moral qualifications, improvement*, and *voluntary endeavor;* nevertheless, it may be more *ordinarily* true that the gift of the Spirit is holden out to *the struggling, the endeavoring, the approaching Christian.* Nor, secondly, is the operation of the Spirit *arbitrary* in its degree; it has a rule, and its rule is this: "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath." Nor is it arbitrary in its final result: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit." *Therefore, it may be grieved.* And "his grace which was bestowed on me was not bestowed in vain." *Therefore, it might have been in vain.* The influence, therefore, of the Spirit may not prevail, even as *the admonitions of a friend—the warnings of parents* may not be successful; may not be attended to—may be rejected—may be despised—may be lost. Throughout the whole, it does not supersede, but co-operate with ourselves."

But another objection is advanced from an opposite quarter. It is said that if the influence of the Spirit depends after all on our endeavors, the doctrine is nugatory. It comes to the same thing as if salvation was put upon ourselves and our endeavors alone. I answer that this is by no means true—that it is not the same thing—either in *reality or opinion, or in the consequences of that opinion.*

But I must break off, as I am called by business. I shall conclude this letter by observing that the above distinctions contended for between an agency that acts arbitrarily, and an agency that *co-operates* with our ability is conceivable, and you will at least admit its *possibility*, although you may deny its existence. If you do not, I must attribute it not to a want of capacity, or to its being a *distinction* without a *difference;* but to your being educated a Calvinist, and not yet being free from the influence of that system. I heard you say yesterday in your lecture on Liberty, that the imperfections in our civil government were to be attributed to the fact that our fathers were just emerging from the darkness of the feudal system, and could not conceive of a system entirely perfect. Now, my dear sir, I remember of having heard you preach *old blue stocking Calvinism*—this you done in the days of yore—and if you cannot now conceive of the difference between Arminianism and Calvinism, on the doctrine of spiritual agency, I must in charity attribute it to the influence of your former associations and habits of thinking, although you may not be conscious

of it. I hope, however, to convince some of your readers, who, like myself, were taken out of the "wild olive," and are not trammelled by the prejudices of education. It is due, however, to many of our Calvinistic brethren to say, that they have given clear illustrations and definitions of this subject, as we shall show in future; indeed, they all agree in disavowing the *consequences* that the Arminians charge on their system. I shall thank you for your remarks in future. If I am in error I want to be convinced of it. I am a lover of plain dealing. Your friendly criticism on my argument for the existence of the Deity, from the works of nature, will be noticed in future, when I have more time, and you have more room in the Harbinger.

Yours sincerely,

J. A. WATERMAN.

MR. A. CAMPBELL.

Editor's Reply.

DEAR SIR,

THERE is in logic nothing like coming to the point, and then keeping to the point. You have now just come to the point to which I desired you to come, and to which I anticipated you would come. Now, my dear sir, that light may be elicited, let us keep the flint and the steel together; and that I may set you an example of what I mean by keeping to the point, I will tell you in the first place, that I have neither room nor disposition to attend to every thing in your letter at once, and that I shall in this only attend to *the one point* which I have been pushing upon your attention since our correspondence commenced. I need not state that the point is, *that all the converting power which the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit now exercises upon the human mind, is in the word.* You say or think that there is some portion of converting power which God exerts upon us *out of the word*, and consequently while I affirm, you deny the truth of the above proposition. So let it be distinctly understood. I have defined the phrase in my last letter to you, and you have not objected to my definition of what I mean by *converting* power; yet you appear to lose sight of it in a single period. I shall, therefore, repeat my definition from page 244:—"You will please observe that the proposition affirms no more than that all the *moral* power [that is, the power of argument and motive] of the Holy Spirit is now in the word. It is *converting* power, or that power of turning the mind of man to love, admire, delight in objects before unknown and unappreciated, of which we speak." To this definition you did not object. You seem only to have lost sight of it in a single period. It is not the *creating* power, nor is it the *governing*, *preserving*, or what is called the *providential* power of God, concerning which we speak or differ. We both agree that the *saving* power of God is different from his *creative* or *providential* power. Hence we speak of the works of creation, providence, and redemption as distinct from each other. Attention to this would have prevented you from such sayings as this: "I am sorry you attempt to reconcile *all* you have said in your essay on the Holy Spirit with what you admit in the way of a special providence."—There is not the least difficulty in reconciling all these matters, if our definition of *converting power* is kept in view.

God was pleased to put forth all his creative power in his word, as Moses tells us in Gen. 1st & 2d chaps. But this is not *the word*, nor *the power*, of which we speak; yet there is an analogy between them: for as God then put forth no creating power but by his word, so now he exhibits no saving or converting power, but through his word. So far analogy helps me forward; but I rely upon it no farther than the laws of analogy will sanction. I have stronger arrows in my quiver than this.

Your first diverging from my definition in your favor before me is in the following words:—"I suppose you will, of course, admit any thing to be converting power which influences a sinner to break off from his sins and turn to God." Grant you this, and then you introduce the ministry of angels as a part of the converting power, *out of the word!!* The slightest inclination of two straight lines will produce an angle; and concede you this appendage to my definition, and we are again upon an ocean of speculations. No, sir, *every thing* which influences a sinner to break off from his sins, is no more converting power, properly so called, than a pill-box is an essential part of the healing power of the pills which it contains. We must cut closer, or take "a finer sight" than this, my dear sir, or we shall be clumsy logicians. Human agency and divine agency are not one and the same thing; yet you may loosely say, that as we live, and move, and have our being in God, our agency is his agency. This would be a sophism incomparably more specious than any one which attributes the power of God's testimony to human or angelic interpositions.

My dear sir, when I talk of conversion I begin with a sinner, and not with a saint. I apply not to a sinner what the Bible says of those who are converted to God. Therefore, an angel strengthening a good man in some deadly anguish, or the Lord's delivering a just person from temptation, are cases not exactly in point. Nor is that of an angel, or a magistrate, or a jail, preventing a sinner from stealing a horse, fully to your purpose. You might as well call a lawyer or a magistrate one of the means of grace, because he once converted a horsethief into an honest man, as bring forth these instances to prove a converting power out of the word. Friend Waterman, you must keep to the point.

Angelic aid is out of the word. I confess it. But did the angel that waited on Cornelius convert Cornelius, or his wife and children? Did not he say, "Send to Joppa for a *man?* And what did the man do who came from Joppa? Tell him "*the words by which he was saved and all his family*" and friends. Would you, my dear sir, confound an angel's visit and Peter's going from Joppa to Cesarea, with the word which Peter spoke? Did the Spirit of God put forth his converting power in the angel's visit, in Peter's visit, or in *the word* which Peter spoke? You might call these circumstances, or occasions, or incidents, or means, connected with the putting forth of that light, and argument, and motive, which constitute converting power; but not a converting power out of the word. To illustrate my meaning and the irrelevancy of all such instances and arguments, permit me to give a similitude:—

A physician is induced to visit a patient who is pining away under a mortal disease. The physician has skill and medicine competent to his cure. But the patient is unwilling to put himself wholly under the guidance of the Doctor, or to take his medicine. The physician tells him that he must die if he take not his medicine; that he can do him no good but by his remedies—for all his *healing* power is in that prescription. Suppose the relatives of the afflicted should actually overcome his reluctance, and induce him to take the medicine; who would say that the healing power of the physician was partly in the medicine and partly in the relatives of the sick? This is exactly to my purpose, intent, and meaning. I limit not human agency, nor angelic agency, nor divine agency in the government of the world; in providence, general or special; nor in the power of circumstances to arrest the attention and to fix the mind upon the arguments and motives which give to the gospel its potency over the mind of man. Men, good and bad, evil spirits, angels, dreams, pestilences, earthquakes, sudden deaths, personal and family afflictions, may become the *occasions* of conversions to God; but they are neither conversion itself, nor God's converting power. Now the difference between us is this: You would say that the physician in the case before us, exercised a power out of his medicine, as well as a power in his medicine; and that the influence of his patient's relatives was as much the healing power of the Doctor as the medicine itself. Keep your mind, my dear sir, upon this, and it will not be in the power of "the wild olive" to shade your intellect, or to cast its penumbra over your soul. I contend that the physician's *healing power* is in the medicine which his science prepared, and not in the tongues of the wife and brother of the afflicted. Their power of persuasion may, however, bring the patient under the healing power of the physician; but still I contend that all the *physician's healing power is in his medicine.*

But to finish my remarks for the present, (for I will resume this subject and keep to this point until I am clearly and fully understood,) I would request you to reconsider the testimony of Paul upon the power of the gospel. He says, "*The gospel is the* POWER OF GOD *to salvation.*" Rom. i. 16. This is my text. You will agree with me that the phrase "*power to salvation*" is equivalent to saving power. If so, then Paul affirms my proposition, or (with more modesty on my part) I should say, I affirm Paul's proposition when I say, "THE GOSPEL IS THE SAVING POWER OF GOD." Now, as you theologians say, converting and saving power is one and the same, I have my whole proposition in the words of the Apostle. The gospel is the converting power of God, or the power of God to the conversion of every one who believes it. Is not this fair, Mr. Waterman? Now the controversy is reduced to very narrow limits. It is all reduced to one question—Does the phrase "*the gospel is the power of God to salvation,*" or the saving or converting power of God, mean what it says; or that it is only a part of the saving and converting power of God? You say it is only a part; but it is a part—I say it is *the* power, the whole power; for if it be not the whole power, it is not *the* power of God to

salvation. The high regard I have for your good sense assures me that you will both see, and feel, and acknowledge the force and evidence of these remarks.

Sincerely your friend,

EDITOR.

P. S.—You will see that I have not adverted at all to your witticisms about my former Calvinism, nor your admiration of certain parts of my philosophy of angels assuming the form of thought, &c. &c. These matters will all work exactly right when we have eradicated the big error. If I succeed in convincing you that all the converting power of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is now in the gospel, all these little matters will wither as the leaf upon an eradicated tree. I trust also to place in proper light the full value of human agency in the work of converting the world.

Editor.

Obituary Notice.

MANY distinguished men have fallen by the pestilence in Europe and America, and many more may yet fall by it. It is not our custom to devote many lines to obituary notices; for were we to indulge our feelings this way, we would soon have our hands full of it. To record the demise of some public men, especially of those who have labored either against or for the reformation, is a necessary part of the history of our times. Amongst those of the former class, who have fallen under the ravages of the cholera, are THOMAS SKILLMAN, Editor of the Presbyterian Western Luminary, Lexington, Ky. and SPENCER CLACK, formerly of Bloomfield, Ky. but latterly of Palmyra, Missouri. The following from the "*Pioneer*," of Illinois, tells a melancholy tale:—

"In Palmyra, Mo. and vicinity, it [cholera] has been singularly fatal. The first victim was the Rev. *Spencer Clack*, a Baptist preacher, and missionary under the Baptist Home Missionary Society, and highly esteemed for his intelligence, piety, and usefulness. His wife soon followed. From the last accounts we learn, that out of a population of between 600 and 700, *one hundred and six deaths had occurred*—a mortality greater, in proportion to the population, than in any part of the United States; and yet Palmyra is 12 miles from the Mississippi, in a high, open, and healthy region!"

☞Epaphras, Nos. 8 and 9, in our next. An apology is due for apparent neglect of these numbers. They were postponed in consequence of the pressure of new correspondents.

THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

EXTRA.

NO. VI.

Bethany, Va. August 5, 1833.

Regeneration.

"I create New Heavens and a New Earth." Is. lxv. 18:
"Behold I make all things New." Rev. xxi. 5.

WE intend an essay full of "the seeds of things." The topic is a common one, a familiar one, and yet it is an interesting one. Much has been said, much has been written upon it; and yet it is no better understood than it ought to be. Few give themselves the trouble of thinking much on the things which they think they understand; and many would rather follow the thoughts of others, than think for themselves. Suspense is painful, much study is a weariness of the flesh; and therefore, the majority are content with the views and opinions handed to them from those who have gone before.

We wish to treat this subject as if it were a new one; and to examine it now, as if we had never examined it before. It is worthy of it. Generation is full of wonders, for it is full of God's physical grandeur; yet regeneration is still more admirable, for in it the moral attributes of Jehovah are displayed. But we aim not at a development of its wonders, but at a plain, common-sense, scriptural exposition of its import.

We have not learned our theology from Athanasius, nor our morality from Seneca; and therefore we shall not call upon them for illustration, argument, or proof. To the Sacred Records, in which alone Christianity yet remains in all its freshness, we look for light; and thither would we direct the eyes of our readers. It is not the regeneration of the schools, in which Christianity has been lowered, misapprehended, obscured, and adulterated, of which we are to write; but that regeneration of which Jesus spoke, and the Apostles wrote.

A few things must be premised—a few general views expressed, before we, or our readers, are prepared for the more minute details; And to approach the subject with all unceremonious despatch, we observe, that--

Man unregenerate is ruined in body, soul, and spirit; a frail and mortal creature. From Adam his father he inherits a shattered constitution. He is the child of a fallen progenitor; a scion from a degenerate stock.

Superior to Adam, the exile from Eden, in physical, intellectual, and moral nature, none of his descendants can rise. It is not in nature to improve itself; for above its fountain the stream cannot rise. Cain, the firstborn of Eve, was in nature the image and likeness of him that begat him. Education failed to improve him, while Abel, his younger brother, obtained the excellency which faith in God's promise alone bestows. The first born, it will be conceded, was at least equal to his younger brother: and who can plead that in nature he excels Eve's eldest son!

Man in his ruins is, however, a proper subject of a remedial system. He is susceptible of renovation. Therefore God has placed him under a regenerating economy. This economy contemplates the regeneration of the whole human constitution, and proposes as its consummation the transformation of spirit, soul, and body. The destiny of the regenerate is described by Paul in one sentence: "As we now bear the image of the earthy Adam, we shall then bear the image of the heavenly Adam."

God's own Son is proposed as the model. Conformity to him in glory, honor and immortality, as the perfection of the regenerate, is the predestination of him who speaks of things that be not, as though they were.

Regeneration is, therefore, moral and physical: or, in other words, there is now a renovation of the mind—of the understanding, will, and affections;—and there will hereafter be a renovation of the body: "For this corruptible body shall put on incorruption, and this mortal body shall put on immortality.

The renovation of the mind and character is, therefore, that moral regeneration which is to be effected in this life; for which the remedial system, or kingdom of heaven, was set up on earth: and this, therefore, first of all, demands our attention.

Before we attempt an answer in detail to the question, *How is this moral regeneration effected?* we shall attend to the principle on which the whole remedial system proceeds. The grand principle, or means which God has adopted for the accomplishment of this moral regeneration, is the full demonstration and proof of a single proposition addressed to the reason of man. This sublime proposition is, THAT GOD IS LOVE.

The reason and wisdom of this procedure will suggest itself to every one who can understand the views and feelings of all unregenerated men. Man, in a state of alienation and rebellion, naturally suspects, that if he be a sinner, and if God hate sin, he must hate

him. As love begets love, so hatred begets hatred; and if a sinner suspects that God hates him, he cannot love God. He must know that God loves him, before he can begin to love God. "We [says an Apostle] love God because he first loved us." While alienated in heart, through the native darkness of his understanding, the sinner misinterprets every restraint which God has placed in his way to prevent his total ruin, as indications of the wrath of heaven. His transgression of these restraints, and his consciousness of having defied the veracity and power of God, only increase his enmity, and urge him onward in his apostacy and wanderings from his creator. The goodness of God, being misunderstood, furnishes to him no incentive to repentance and reformation. Guilt and fear, and shame, the fruits of his apostacy, becloud his understanding, and veil from his eye all the demonstrations of benevolence and goodness with which the creation abounds. Adam under a tree, hiding from God, trembling with fear, suspicious of the movements of every leaf, and covered with shame as with a garment, is both an illustration and proof of these views of the state of mind which obtains in the unregenerate.

Neither the volume of creation, nor that of God's providence, is sufficient to remove from the natural man these misconceptions, and the consequent alienation of heart. The best proof that these two volumes cannot do this, is, that they never have, in any one instance, yet done it. From the nature of things it is indeed evident that they cannot do it. The elements are too often at war with the happiness of man. The ever-changing attitude of the natural world in reference to health, and life, and comfort, render it at best doubtful, whether the laws of nature, which ultimately bring man down to the grave, are the effect of benevolence, or of malevolence towards mankind. A third volume, explanatory of both, and replete also with supernatural developments, is wanting, to furnish the most diligent student of nature and providence, with the means of learning the true and full character of him against whom we have rebelled.

That volume is the Bible. Holy Prophets and Apostles spake as they were moved by the Spirit of Knowledge and Revelation. Its records, its history, its prophecy, its precepts, its laws, its ordinances, and its examples, all develope and reveal God to man, and man to himself.

But it is in the person and mission of the INCARNATE WORD that we learn that *God is love.* That God gave his Son for us, and yet gives his Spirit to us,—and thus gives us himself—are the mysteries and transcendent proofs of the most august proposition in the universe. The gospel, Heaven's wisdom and power combined, God's own expedient for the renovation of human nature, is no more nor less, than the illustration and proof of this regenerating proposition.

Thus we hasten to our subject. Having glanced at the great landmarks of the plantations of nature and grace, now that we may, in the light of truth, ascertain the true and heaven-taught doctrine of regeneration, we shall cautiously survey the whole process as deve-

loped by the commissioned teachers of the deep counsels of the only true God.

That certain things, parts of this great process, may be well understood, certain terms which we are wont to use to represent them, must be well defined, and accurately apprehended. These terms are *Fact, Tsstimony, Faith, Repentance, Reformation, Bath of Regeneration, New Birth, Renewing of the Holy Spirit, Newness of Life.*

"All things are of God" in the regeneration of man, is our motto; because our Apostle affirmed this as a cardinal truth. He is the author of the *facts*, and of the *testimony* which declares them; and being the author of these, he is the author of all the effects produced by these facts. The Christian is a new *creation*, of which God is the *Creator.* The change of heart and of character, which constitute moral regeneration, is the legitimate impression of the facts, or things which God has wrought. The facts constitute the moral seal which stamps the image of God upon man. In the natural order we must place them first, and therefore we must first define the term.

Fact.

Fact means something done. The term *deed*, so common in the reign of James the First, is equivalent to our term *fact.* Truth and fact, though often confounded, are not the same. All facts are truths, but all truths are not facts. That God exists, is a truth, but not a fact; that he created the heavens and the earth, is a fact and a truth. That Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, is a truth, but not a fact; and hat he preached Christ to the Gentiles, is both a fact and a truth. The simple agreement of the terms of any proposition with the subject of that proposition, or the representation of any thing as it exists, is a truth. But something must be done, acted, or effected, before we have a fact. There are many things in religion, morals, politics, and general science, which are not facts; but these are all but the correspondence of words and ideas with the things of which they treat.

Facts have a power which simple truth has not; and, therefore, we say, that facts are stubborn things. They are *things*, not *words.* The power of any fact, is the meaning; and therefore the measure of its power is the magnitude of its import. All moral facts have a moral meaning; and those are properly called moral facts, which either exhibit, develope, or form moral character. All those facts, or works of God, which are purely physical, exhibit what have been commonly called his natural or physical perfections; and all those facts, or works of God, which are purely moral, exhibit his moral character. It so happens, however, that all his works, when properly understood, exhibit both his physical and moral character, when viewed in all their proper relations. Thus the deluge exhibited his power, his justice, and his truth; and, therefore, displayed both his physical and moral grandeur. The turning of water into wine, apart from its design, is purely a demonstration of physical power; but when its design is apprehended, it has a moral force equal to its physical majesty.

The work of Redemption is a system of works, or deeds, on the part of heaven, which constitute the most splendid series of moral facts which man or angel ever saw. And they are the proof, the argument, or the demonstration, of that regenerating proposition which presents God and *love* as two names for one idea.

When these facts are understood, or brought into immediate contact with the mind of man, as a moral seal or archetype, they delineate the image of God upon the human soul. *All the means of grace are, therefore, only the means of impressing this seal upon the heart; of bringing these moral facts to make their full impression on the soul of man.* Testimony and faith are but the channel through which these facts, or the hand of God, draws his image on the heart and character of man. If then the fact and the testimony are both the gift of God, we may well say that faith and eternal life are also the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

To enumerate the gospel facts, would be to narrate all that is recorded of the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ, from his birth to his coronation in the heavens. They are, however, concentrated in a few prominent ones, which group together all the love of God in the gift of his Son. He died for our sins, He was buried in our grave, He rose from the dead for our justication, and is ascended to the skies to prepare mansions for his disciples, comprehend the whole, or are the heads to the chapters which narrate the love of God, and display his moral majesty and glory to our view.

These moral facts unfold all the moral grandeur of Jehovah, and make Jesus the effulgence of his glory, the express image of his substance. These are the moral seal which *testimony* conveys to the understanding, and *faith* brings to the heart of sinners, by which God creates them anew, and forms them for his glory. It is the Spirit which bears witness—the Spirit of God and of Christ which gives the testimony, and confirms it in the disciples. But let us next proceed to *testimony.*

Testimony.

The Romans, from whom we have borrowed much of our language, called the witness the *testis.* The declaration of this *testis* is still called testimony. In refence to the material system around us, to all objects and matters of sense, the eye, the ear, the smell, the taste, the feeling, are the five witnesses. What we call the evidence of sense, is, therefore, the testimony of these witnesses, which constitute the five avenues to the human mind from the kingdom of nature. They are figuratively called witnesses, and their evidence, testimony. But the report or declaration of intelligent beings, such as God, angels, and men, constitute what is properly and literally called *testimony.*

As light reflected from any material object upon the eye brings that object into contact with the eye, or enables the object to make its image on the eye, so testimony concerning any fact, brings that fact into contact with the mind, and enables it to impress itself, or to form

its image upon the intellect, or mind of man. Now, be it observed, that as by our five external senses we acquire all information of the objects of sense around us, so by testimony, human or divine, we receive all our information upon all facts which are not the objects of the immediate exercise of our five senses upon the things around us.

To appreciate the full value of testimony in the divine work of regeneration, we have only to reflect, that all the moral facts which can form moral character, after the divine standard, or which can effect a moral or religious change in man, are found in the testimony of God; and that no fact can operate at all where it is not present; or where it is not known. The love of God in the death of the Messiah never drew a tear of gratitude or joy from any eye, or excited a grateful emotion in any heart among the nations of our race to whom the testimony never came. No fact in the history of six thousand years, no work of God in creation, providence, or redemption, has ever influenced the heart of man or woman to whom it has not been testified. Testimony is, then, in regeneration, as necessary as the fact of which it speaks.

The real value of any thing, is the labor which it cost, and its utility when acquired. If reason and justice arbitrated all questions upon the value of property, the decision would be, that every article is worth the amount of human labor which is necessary to obtain it; and when obtained, it is again to be tried in the scales of utility. Now as all the facts, and all the truth, which can renovate human nature, are in the testimony of God; and as that testimony cost the labor and the lives of the wisest and best that ever lived, that testimony, to us, is just as valuable as the facts which it records, and the labors and the lives which it cost, and just as indispensable in the process of regeneration, as were the labors and the lives of Prophets, Apostles, and the Son of God.

History, or narrative, whether oral or written, is only another name for testimony. When, then, we reflect how large a proportion of both Testaments is occupied in history, we may judge of how much importance it is in the judgment of God. Prophecy also, being the history of future facts, or a record of things to be done, belongs to the same chapter of facts and record. Now if all past facts, and all future facts, or all the history or testimony concerning them, was erased from the volumes of God's inspiration, how small would the remainder be! These considerations, added together, only in part exhibit the value and utility of testimony in the regeneration of mankind. But its value will be still more evident when the proper import of the term *faith* is fully set before us.

Faith.

No testimony, no faith: for faith is only the belief of testimony, or confidence in testimony as true. To believe without testimony, is just as impossible as to see without light. The measure, quality, and power of faith, are always found in the testimony believed.

Where testimony begins, faith begins; and where testimony ends, faith ends. We believe Moses just as far as Moses speaks or writes; and when Moses has recorded his last fact, or testified his last truth, our faith in Moses terminates. His five books are, therefore, the length and breadth, the height and depth, or, in other words, the *measure* of our faith in Moses. The *quality* or value of faith is found in the quality or value of the testimony. The certainty of faith, is the certainty of the testimony. If the testimony be valid and authoritative, our faith is strong and operative. "If," says John, "we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater," stronger and more worthy of credit. The value of a bank bill, is the amount of the precious metals which it represents, and the indisputable evidence of its genuineness; so the value of faith is the importance of the facts which the testimony presents, and the assurance afforded that the testimony is true. True, or unfeigned faith, may be contrasted with feigned faith, but true faith is the belief of truth; for he that believes a lie, believes in vain.

The *power* of faith is also the power, or moral meaning of the testimony, or of the facts which the testimony represents. If by faith I am transported with joy, or overwhelmed in sorrow, that joy or sorrow is in the facts contained in the testimony, or in the nature and relation of those facts to me. If faith purifies the heart, works by love, and overcomes the world, this power is in the facts believed. If a father has more joy in believing that a lost son has been found, than in believing that a lost sheep has been brought home to his fold, the reason of this greater joy is not in the nature of his faith, but in the nature of the facts believed.

Here I am led to expatiate on a very popular and pernicious error of modern times. That error is, that the nature, or power and saving efficacy of faith, is not in the truth believed, but in the *nature* of our faith, or in *the manner of believing* the truth. Hence all that unmeaning jargon about the nature of faith, and all those disdainful sneers at what is called "historic faith"—as if there could be any faith without history, written or spoken. Who ever believed in Jesus Christ, without hearing the history of him? "*How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?*" Faith never can be more than the receiving of testimony as true, or the belief of testimony; and if the testimony be written, it is called history—though it is as much history when flowing from the tongue, as when flowing from the pen.

Let it be again repeated, and remembered, that there is no other manner of believing a fact, than receiving it as true. If it is not received as true, it is not believed; and when it is believed, it is no more than regarded as true. This being conceded, then it follows that the efficacy of faith is always in the fact believed, or the object received, and not in the nature or manner of believing.———

"Faith was bewildered much by men who meant
To make it clear, so simple in itself,
A thought so rudimental and so plain,
That none by comment could it plainer make.

All faith was one. In object, not in kind,
The difference lay. The faith that saved a soul,
And that which in the common truth believed,
In essence, were the same. Hear, then, what faith,
True, Christian faith, which brought salvation, was:
Belief in all that God revealed to men;
Observe, in all that God revealed to men,
In all he promised, threatened, commanded, said,
Without exception, and without a doubt."

Pollok's Course of Time, Book viii. p. 189.

This holds universally in all the sensitive, intellectual, and moral powers of man. All our pleasures and pains, all our joys and sorrows, are the effects of the objects of sensation, reflection, faith, &c. apprehended or received, and not in the nature of the exercise of any power or capacity with which we are endowed. We shall illustrate and confirm this assertion by an appeal to the experience of all.

Let us glance at all our sensitive powers. If on surveying with the eye a beautiful landscape, I am pleased, and on surveying a battle field strewed with the spoils of death, I am pained, is it in accordance with truth to say, that the pleasure or the pain received was occasioned by the nature of vision, or the mode of seeing? Was it not *the sight*, the thing seen, the object of vision, which produced the pleasure and the pain? The action of looking, or the mode of seeing, was in both cases the same; but the things seen, or the objects of vision, were different;—consequently, the effects produced were different.

If on hearing the melody of the grove I am delighted, and on hearing the peals of thunder breaking to pieces the cloud, dark with horror, hanging over my head, I am terrified, is the delight or the terror to be ascribed to the manner or nature of hearing, or to the thing heard? Is it not the thing heard, which produces the delight and the terror?

If I am refreshed by the balmy fragrance of the opening bloom of spring, or sickened by the fetid effluvia of putrid carcases, are these effects to be ascribed to the peculiar nature or mode of smelling, or to the thing smelt? Or when the honey or the gall come in contact with my taste, is the sweet or the bitter to be regarded as the effect of my manner of tasting, or to the object tasted? And when I touch the ice, or the blazing torch, is the effect or feeling produced to be imputed to the manner of feeling them, or to the thing felt? May we not, then affirm that all the pleasures and pains of sense; all the effects of sensation, are the results, not of the manner in which our five senses are exercised, but of the objects on which they are exercised? It may be said, without in the least invalidating this conclusion, that the more intimate the exercise of our senses is with the things on which they are exercised, the stronger and more forcible will be the impressions made; but still it is the object seen, heard, smelt, tasted, or felt, which affects us.

Passing from the outward to the inward man, and on examining the powers of intellection one by one, we shall find no exception to the law which pervades all our sensitive powers. It is neither the

faculty of perception, nor the exercise of perception, nor the manner of perception, but the thing perceived, that excites us to action: it is not the exercise of reflection, but the thing reflected upon: it is not memory, nor the exercise of recollection, but the thing remembered: it is not imagination, but the thing imagined: it is not reason itself, nor the exercise of reason, but the thing reasoned upon, which affords pleasure or pain—which excites to action—which cheers, allures, consoles—which grieves, disquiets, or discommodes us.

Ascending to our volitions and our affections, we shall find the same universality. In a word, it is not choosing, nor refusing; it is not loving, hating, fearing, desiring, nor hoping; it is not the nature of any power, faculty, or capacity of our nature, nor the simple exercise of them, but the objects or things upon which they are exercised, which give us pleasure or pain; which induces us to action, or influences our behaviour. Faith, then, or the power of believing, must be an anomalous thing; a power *sui generis;* an exception to the laws under which every power, faculty, or capacity of man is placed, unless its measure, quality, power, and efficacy, be in the things believed, in the facts which are testified, in the objects on which it terminates.

There is no connexion of cause and effect more intimate; there is no system of dependencies more closely linked; there is no arrangement of things more natural or necessary, than the ideas represented by the terms *fact*, *testimony*, *faith*, and *feeling*. The first is for the last, and the two intermediates are made necessary by the force of circumstances, as the means for the end. The fact, or the thing said or done, produces the change in the frame of mind. The testimony, or report of the thing said or done, is essential to belief; and belief of it, is necessary to bring the thing said or done to the heart. The change of heart, is the end proposed in this part of the process of regeneration; and we may see that the process on the part of heaven is, thus far, natural and rational: or, in other words, consistent with the constitution of our nature.

Repentance.

Repentance is usually defined "*sorrow for any thing past*," and in the religious vocabulary it is simply *sorrow for sin*." This is one, but it is only one of the natural effects of the belief of the testimony of God. The gospel facts, testimony and faith, contemplate more than this. But yet it is necessary that this point of faith should be distinctly apprehended, especially in this age, when it occupies so large a space in the systems of theology.

Repentance, in our current acceptation, is sorrow for sin; and certainly there is no man who believes the revealed facts found in the testimony of God, who will not be sorry for his sins. But simple sorrow for the past, is but a feeling of the heart which, unless it excite to reformation, or the abandonment of sin, is of no more use than the regrets of Judas after he had sold his Master for fifteen dollars.

Repentance must, however, precede reformation: for unless we are sorry for the past, and grieved with ourselves, we will not think of a change of conduct. Repentance is to reformation, what motive is to action, or resolution to any undertaking. It was well for David to resolve to build the temple; and so it is well to form any good design, but much better to execute it. To feel sorry for the poor and the afflicted, and to resolve to assist and comfort them, is well, but to go and do it is better: and, indeed, unless our sorrow for the past terminates in reformation for the future, it is useless in the estimation of heaven and earth; as useless as to say to the hungry, Be filled; or to the naked, Be clothed.

Genuine repentance does not always issue in reformation. Judas was sorrowful even to death, but could not reform. Many have been so genuinely sorry for their sins, as to become suicides. Speak we of "a godly sorrow"? No; this is not to be expected from unconverted and ungodly persons. Christians, Paul teaches, when they err may repent with a godly sorrow; but this is not to be expected from the unregenerate, or from those who have not reformed. It is not, then, the genuineness of repentance that is to be appreciated, unless by genuine repentance is meant more than simple sorrow for the past—unless by genuine repentance is meant reformation. Yet without sincere or unfeigned repentance, there cannot be real or genuine reformation.

This leads us to observe, that the only unequivocal evidence of sincere repentance, is the actual redress of the injury done; not only a cessation from the sin, but a restitution for the sin, as far as restitution can possibly be made. *No restitution, no repentance—provided restitution can be made.* And may I be permitted to add, *that without repentance, and restitution when possible, there can be no remission.*

The preachers of repentance—of the necessity of repentance in order to remission, ought to set this matter fairly and fully before sinners. Do they represent repentance as sorrow for the past, and a determination to reform? How then will the sinner know that he is sorry for his sins against men, or how will the community know that he has repented of such sins, unless full restitution be made? It is impossible that either the sinner himself, or the community who know his sins against man, can have any certain evidence that he is penitent, unless by making all possible restitution.

Peccator wounded the reputation of his neighbor Hermas, and on another occasion defrauded him of ten pounds. Some of the neighborhood were apprized that he had done both. Peccator was converted under the preaching of Paulinus, and on giving in a relation of his sorrow for his sins, spoke of the depth of his convictions, and of his abhorrence of his transgressions. He was received into the congregation, and sat down with the faithful to commemorate the great sin offering. Hermas and his neighbors were witnesses of all this. They saw that Peccator was penitent, and much reformed in his behaviour; but they could not believe him sincere, because that he had

made no restitution. They regarded him as either a hpocrite, or self-deceived; because, having it in his power, he repaid not the ten pounds, nor once contradicted the slanders he had propagated. Peccator, however, felt little enjoyment in his profession, and soon fell back into his former habits. He became again penitent, and on examining the grounds of his falling off, discovered that he had never cordially turned away from his sins. Overwhelmed in sorrow for the past, he resolved on giving himself up to the Lord; and, reflecting on his past life, set about the work of reformation in earnest. He called on Hermas, paid him his ten pounds and the interest for every day he had kept it back, went to all the persons to whom he had slandered him, told them what injustice he had done him, and begged them, if they had told it to any other persons, to contradict it. Several other persons whom he had wronged in his dealings with them, he also visited; and fully redressed all these wrongs against his neighbors. He also confessed them to the Lord, and asked him to forgive him.—Peccator was then restored to the church, and, better still, he enjoyed a peace of mind and a confidence in God, which was a continual feast. His example, moreover, did more to enlarge the congregation at the Cross-roads, than did the preaching of Paulinus in a whole year. This was, unequivocally *sincere* repentance.

This is the repentance which Moses preached, and which Jesus approbated. Under the law, confession to the priest, and the presenting of a trespass offering, availed nothing to forgiveness without restitution. As the theory of repentance is much lost sight of in this our degenerate age, and as the practice is still more rare, we think it not amiss to be still more explicit on this topic. We shall therefore hear the law and the gospel both on this subject.

In Leviticus, chap. vi. 1—7, we have the word of the Lord upon this subject:—"And the Lord spake to Moses, saying: If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie to his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, (i. e. dealing,) or in a thing taken away by violence, or has deceived his neighbor; or have found that which was lost and lies concerning it, and swears falsely; in any of these that a man does, sinning therein: then it shall be because he has sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he has deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he has found, or all that about which he has sworn falsely: he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it to him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering. And he shall bring his trespass offering to the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass offering to the priest. And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord; and it shall be forgiven him, for any thing of all that he has done, in trespassing therein."

Thus spoke the Lord to Moses. From which we learn that, under the former economy, a trespass offering to the Lord without restitution to man, or restitution to man without a trespass offering to the

Lord, availed not to forgiveness. Thus was repentance preached by Moses. But the law went into details still more minute than these; for provision is made for the case in which the sinner could not find the person against whom he had sinned. In such a case, the penitent sinner was to seek out the kindred of the injured party, and if he could find any kinsman, he was to recompense this kinsman; but if he could not find a kinsman, he must recompense it to the Lord, besides offering his trespass offering. It was to go into the Lord's treasury. See Numb. v. 7, 8. The principle uniformly, in all cases of sin against man, was, the sinner "shall make amends for the harm he has done, and shall add the fifth part thereto." Lev. v. 16.

If any one suppose that repentance is to be less sincere or unequivocal under the gospel, let him remember that Zaccheus proposed more than adding a fifth, he would restore fourfold, and that Jesus approbated him for so doing Indeed, John the Immerser demanded fruits worthy of repentance or of reformation, and Paul proclaimed that those who turn to God should do works meet or worthy of repentance. Acts xxvi. 20.

"Works worthy of repentance" is a phrase which can be understood in no other sense than those works which make amends for the harm done to men, and the dishonor done to God, as far as both are possible. Can any man think that he is sorry for that sin or wrong which he has done, when he makes no effort to make amends to him who was injured in person, character, or property, by it? Works worthy of his professed repentance are wanting, so long as any being whom he has injured in person, property, or reputation, is unredressed to the utmost extent of his ability.

One of our most popular commentators says—and with much truth —"No man should expect mercy at the hand of God, who having wronged his neighbor, refuses, when he has it in his power to make *restitution*. Were he to weep tears of blood, both the justice and mercy of God would shut out his prayer, if he make not his neighbor amends for the injury he has done him. He is a dishonest man, who illegally holds the property of another in his hands."—*Adam Clarke* on Gen. xl. 2.

Every preacher of repentance should insist upon these evidences of sincerity, both for the satisfaction of the penitent himself, and for the good of the community. Acts xix. 18—20 is quite to the point: "Many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds—many of them also who used curious arts, bringing their books together, burnt them before all: and they computed the value of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver." This was making restitution, in their case, as far as possible; and the principle here evinced is applicable in every other case.

But in pursuing this subject so far, we have passed over the boundaries of repentance, and sometimes confounded it with reformation. This is owing to the licentious use of language to which modern theology has so richly contributed. We shall, however, redress this wrong as far as practicable, by a few remarks on

Reformation.

The word *metanoia*, used by the sacred writers and heaven taught preachers of the New Economy as indicative of the first effect of faith, as has been often showed, is different from that which our word *repentance* fitly represents. It literally imports *a change of mind;* but, as Parkhurst, Campbell, and many others say, such a change of mind "as influences ones' subsequent behaviour for the better." Dr. Campbell, Diss. vi. p. 3, says: "It has been observed by some, and I think with reason, that the former (*metanoeo*) denotes, properly, a change to the better; the latter (*metamelomai*) barely a change, whether to the better or to the worse; that the former marks a change of mind that is durable, and produces consequences; the latter expresses only a present uneasy feeling of regret, without regard to duration or effects: in fine, that the first may be translated into English, *I reform*, the second, *I repent*, in the familiar acceptation of the words." Now as every one who reforms repents, but as every one who repents does not reform, this distinction is necessary and proper; and there is nothing hazarded, nothing lost by translating the former *I reform*, and the latter *I repent*. There is something gained, especially in all places where we have the word in the imperative mood, because then it is of importance to know precisely what is intended. If we are commanded only to change our mind, or to be sorry for the past, we have obeyed when we feel regret; but if more than mere change of mind or regret is intended, we have not obeyed the commandment until we change for the better. Now it is, we think, very evident from various passages of the sacred writings of the Apostles, and from their speeches, that they commanded more than a simple change of mind as respected past conduct, or mere sorrow for the past. Peter commanded the thousands assembled on the day of Pentecost, who had changed their minds, and who were sorry for the past, to do something which they had not yet done; and that something is in the common version rendered *repent*, and in the new version *reform*, and in the old English Bible "*amend your lives*." The word here used is the imperative of *metanoeo*. Judas repented, and many like him, who never reformed; and, therefore, it is of importance that this distinction should be kept in view. But for a more full illustration and proof of this we must refer our readers to Note 39, p. 74, Family Testament.

Repentance is not reformation, but is necessary to it; for whoever reforms, must first repent. Reformation is, indeed, the carrying out of the purpose into our conduct. But as reformation belongs rather to another part of our essay than the present, we shall, on the premises already before us, pause and offer a few reflections.

In the preceding definitions of words and ideas, it would appear that we have a literal and unfigurative representation of the whole process of what is figuratively called regeneration. For, as we shall soon see, the term *regeneration* is a figure of speech which very ap-

propriately, though analogically, represents the reformation or renovation of life of which we have now spoken.

That the preceding arrangement is not arbitrary, but natural and necessary, the reader will perceive when he reflects, that the thing done, or the fact, must precede the report or testimony concerning it; that the testimony concerning it must precede the belief of it; that belief of the testimony must precede any feeling in correspondence with the fact testified; and that feeling must precede action in conformity to it. Fact, testimony, faith, feeling, action, are therefore bound together by a natural and gracious necessity, which no ingenuity can separate. And will not every Christian say, that when a person *feels* and *acts* according to the faith, or the testimony of God, he is a new creature—regenerate—truly converted to God? He that believes the facts testified in the record of God, understands them, feels according to their nature and meaning, and acts in correspondence with them—has undergone a change of heart and of life which makes him a new man.

This is that moral change of heart and life which is figuratively called *regeneration.* We are not to suppose that regeneration is something which must be added to the faith, the feeling, and the action or behavior, which are the effects of the testimony of God understood and embraced; or which are the impress of the divine facts attested by Prophets and Apostles. It is only another name for the same process in all its parts.

It may also be observed that numerous figures and analogies are used by the inspired writers to set forth this change, as well as other leading truths and lessons in the Bible. In their collective capacity Christians are called a kingdom, a nation, a generation, a family, a house, a flock, a city, a temple, a priesthood, &c. In their individual capacity they are called kings, priests, soldiers, citizens, children, sheep, branches, stones, &c. They are said to be begotten, born, regenerated, builded, engrafted, converted, created, planted. Now, under whatever figure they are considered or introduced, reason argues that every thing said of them should be expressed in conformity with the figure under which they are presented. Are they called *sheep?* Then he that presides over them is called a *Shepherd;* their enemies are *wolves* and *dogs;* their sustenance is the *green pasture;* their place of safety and repose, the *sheepfold;* their errors are *wanderings* and *strayings;* their conversion, a *return;* and their good behavior a *hearing of the voice*, or a *following* of the Shepherd. Are they called *children?* Then collectively they are a *family;* they are *begotten* and *born again;* God is their *Father;* their separation is an *adoption;* Jesus is their *elder brother;* they are *heirs* of God; they *live* and *walk* with God. Are they *priests?* Jesus is their *High Priest;* the church is their *temple;* the Saviour is their *altar;* their songs, their praises are *incense* ascending to heaven; and their oblations to the poor, their works of love, are *sacrifices* most acceptable to God. Are they called *citizens?* The church is then *the kingdom of heaven; Jerusalem is the mother of them all;* formerly they were *aliens*, and their natural-

ization is *regeneration.* Are they called *branches*? Then Jesus is the *true vine;* his Father the *vine-dresser;* their union with Christ, an *engrafting;* the discipline of the gospel, a *pruning;* and their good works are *fruits of righteousness.*

Thus there is no confusion of metaphors in the Scriptures of truth, in the dialect of heaven. It is the language of Ashdod, it belongs to the confusion of Babel, to mingle and confound all figures and analogies. Hence we so often hear of *being born again,* without any allusion to a family or a kingdom! and of *regeneration* as antecedent to faith or repentance! Had a modern assembly of Divines been employed to accommodate the Scripture style to their orthodox sentiments, we should not have had to read all the Old Testament and all the historic books of the New, to find the subject of regeneration but once proposed to an alien, as the fact is; but then we should have found it in the history of Abel, of Enoch, of Noah, and of Abraham, if not in every section of the law of Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms. John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Holy Twelve would have had it in every sermon; and true faith would have been always defined as the fruit of regeneration.

But Jesus had a *kingdom* in his eye and in his discourse before he ever mentioned being "born again" to Nicodemus: for unless there was a family, a state, or a kingdom to be born into, it is impossible for any one to be born into it. And if the kingdom of heaven only began to be after Jesus entered into heaven; or, if it was only approaching from the ministry of John to the day of Pentecost, then it would have been preposterous, indeed—an incongruity of which no inspired man was ever guilty—to call any change of heart or life *a regeneration,* or *a new birth.* It is true that good men in all ages were made such by facts, testimony, faith, and feeling, by a change of heart, by the Spirit of God; but the *analogy* or *figure* of being *born,* or of being *regenerated,* only began to be used when the kingdom of heaven began to be preached, and when men began to press into it.

We are now, perhaps, better prepared to consider the proper import and meaning of "*regeneration*" in general, and of "*the bath of regeneration*" in particular.

Regeneration.

This word is found but twice in all the oracles of God—once in Matthew xix. 28. and once in Titus iii. 5. In the former it is almost universally understood to mean a *new state of things,* not of *persons*—a peculiar era, in which all things are to be made new:—such as the formation of a new church on the day of Pentecost, or the commencement of the Millennium, or the general resurrection. The biblical critics of eminence have assigned it to one or other of these great changes in the state of things. So we use the word *revolution,* and the phrase *the Revolution,* to express a change in the political state of things. The most approved punctuation and version of this passage renders it altogether evident that a new era is alluded to: "Jesus an-

swered, Indeed, I say to you, that at the renovation (regeneration) when the Son of Man shall be seated on his glorious throne, you, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel." This being so evident, and so often alluded to in our former writings, we shall proceed to the remaining occurrence, Titus iii. 5.

All the new light which we propose to throw on this passage will be gathered from an examination of the acceptation of the word *generation* in the sacred writings. Our reason for this is, that we object to a peremptory decision of the meaning of a word which occurs only in the passage under discussion, from our reasonings upon the insulated passage in which it is found. In such a case, if we cannot find the whole word in any parallel passages, the proper substitute is the root or branches of that word, so far as they are employed by the same writers. Moreover, we think it will be granted, that whatever may be the scriptural acceptation of the word *generation*, regeneration is only the repetition of that act or process.

After a close examination of all the passages in which *generation* occurs in the writings of the Hebrew Prophets and Apostles, we find it used only in two acceptations—as descriptive of the whole process of creation and of the thing created. A race of men, or a particular class of men, is called a *generation;* but this is its figurative, rather than its literal meaning. Its literal meaning is the formation or creation of any thing. Thus it is first used in the Holy Scriptures. Moses (Gen. ii. 4.) calls the creation, or whole process of formation of the heavens and the earth, "the *generations* of the heavens and the earth." The account of the formation of Adam and Eve, and also the account of the creations of Adam and Eve, are, by the same writer, called "the book or record of the *generations* of Adam." Gen. v. 1. This is the literal import of the word; consequently, *regeneration* literally indicates the whole process of renovating or new-creating man.

This process may consist of numerous distinct acts; but it is in accordance with general usage to give to the beginning, or consummating act, the name of the whole process. For the most part, however, the name of the whole process is given to the consummating act, because the process is always supposed incomplete until that act is performed. For example: in the process of tanning, fulling, forging, &c. the subject of these operations is not supposed to be tanned, fulled, forged, until the last act is performed. So in all the processes of nature—in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms—the last act consummates the process. To all acquainted with the process of animalization, germination, crystalization, &c. no farther argument is needed. But, in the style of our American husbandmen, no crop nor animal is *made*, until it come to maturity. We often hear them say of a good shower, or of a few clear days, "This is the *making* of the wheat, or corn." In the same sense it is that most Christians call *regeneration*, the NEW BIRTH; though being born is only the last act in natural generation, and the last act in regeneration.

In this way the *new birth* and *regeneration* are used indiscriminately by commentators and writers on theology; and, by a figure of speech, it is justified on well established principles of rhetoric. This leads us to speak particularly of

The Bath of Regeneration.

By "*the bath of regeneration*" is not meant the first, second, or third act; but the last act of regeneration which completes the whole, and is, therefore, used to denote the new birth. This is the reason why our Lord and his Apostles unite this act with water. Being *born of water*, in the Saviour's style, and *the bath of regeneration*, in the Apostles' style, in the judgment of all writers and critics of eminence, refer to one and the same act—viz. Christian baptism. Hence it came to pass that *all the ancients* (as fully proved in our first Extra on Remission) used the word *regeneration* as synonymous in signification with *immersion*. In addition to the numerous quotations made in our Essay on Remission, from the creeds and liturgies of Protestant churches, we shall add another from the Common Prayer of the Church of England, showing unequivocally that the learned Doctors of that church used the words *regeneration* and *baptism* as synonymous. In the address and prayer of the minister after the baptism of the child, he is commanded to say,

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's church; let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayer unto him, that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning."

Then shall be said, all kneeling,

"We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant that he, being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of thy Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of thy holy church, he may be an inheriter of thine everlasting kingdom, through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Eusebius, in his Life of Constantine, p. 628, shows that St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, and, indeed, all the Greek Fathers, did regard baptism as the consummating act; and therefore they called it *teliosis*, the consummation. These authorities weigh nothing with us; but as they weigh with our opponents, we think it expedient to remind them on which side the Fathers depose in the case before us. By these quotations we would prove no more than that the ancients understood the washing of regeneration; and, indeed, used the term *regeneration* as synonymous with baptism.

But were we asked for the precise import of the phrase, "washing or bath of regeneration," either on philological principles, or as explained by the Apostles, we would give it as our judgment that the phrase is a circumlocution or periphrasis for water. It is *loutron*, a

word which more properly signifies the vessel that contains the water, than the water itself; and is, therefore, by the most learned critics and translators, rendered *bath*, as indicative either of the vessel containing the fluid, or of the use made of the fluid in the vessel. It is therefore by a metonymy the water of baptism, or the water in which we are regenerated. Paul was a Hebrew, and spoke in the Hebrew style. We must learn that style before we fully understand the Apostle's style. In other words, we must studiously read the Old Testaments before we can accurately understand the New. What more natural for a Jew accustomed to speak of "the water of purification," of "the water of separation,"* to speak of "the bath of regeneration"? If the phrase "water of purification" meant water used for the purpose of purifying a person—if "the water of separation" meant water used for separating a person, what more natural than "the bath of regeneration" should mean water used for regenerating a person?

But the New Testament itself confirms this exposition of the phrase. We find the word *loutron* once more used by the same Apostle, in the same connexion of thought. In his letter to the Ephesians, chap. v. 26, he affirms that Jesus has sanctified (separated, purified with the water of purification) the church by a *loutron* of water—"a bath of water, with the word"—"having cleansed it by a bath of water, with the word." This is still more decisive. The common version, so fully aware that the sense of this passage agrees with Titus iii. 5. have, in both places, used the word *washing*, and Macknight the term *bath*, as the import of *loutron*. What is called the *washing*, or *bath of regeneration*, in the one passage, is, in the other, called "the washing," or "bath of water." What is called "*saved*" in one, is called "*cleansed*" in the other; and what is called "*the renewal of the Holy Spirit*" in the one, is called "*the word*" in the other; because the Holy Spirit consecrates or cleanses through the word. For thus prayed the Messiah, "Consecrate them through the truth: thy word is the truth." And again, "You are clean through the word that I have spoken to you."

To the same effect, Paul, to the Hebrew Christians, says, "Having your hearts sprinkled from a guilty conscience, and your bodies washed with pure water—the water of purification, the water of regeneration. For the phrase "pure water" must be understood, not of the quality of the water, but metonymically, of the effect, the cleansing, the washing, or the purifying of the person—"having your bodies or persons *washed* with pure water," or water that purifies or cleanses.

None, acquainted with Peter's style, will think it strange that Paul represents persons as *saved*, *cleansed*, or *sanctified* by water; seeing Peter unequivocally asserts that "*we are saved*" through water, or through baptism, as was Noah and his family through water and faith in God's promise. "The antitype" (like figure) "immersion, does also now save us."

Finally, our great Prophet, the Messiah, gives to water the same place and power in this work of regeneration. For when speaking

*See Numbers viii. 7. xix. 9, 13, 20, 21. xxxi. 23.

of being *born again*—when explaining to Nicodemus *the new birth*, he says, "Except a man be *born of water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." May not we then, supported by such high authorities, call that water of which a person is born again, the water or bath of regeneration?

New Birth.

We have already seen that the consummation of the process of generation or creation is in the birth of the creature formed. So it is in the moral generation, or in the great process of regeneration. There is a state of existence from which he that is born passes; and there is a state of existence into which he enters after birth. This is true of the whole animal creation, whether oviparous or viviparous. Now the manner of existence, or the mode of life, is wholly changed; and he is, in reference to the former state, dead, and to the new state alive. So in moral regeneration. The subject of this great change before his new birth existed in one state; but after it he exists in another. He stands in a new relation to God, angels, and men. He is now born of God, and has the privilege of being a son of God, and is consequently pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, saved. The state which he left was a state of condemnation, what some call "the state of nature." The state into which he enters is a state of favor, in which he enjoys all the heavenly blessings through Christ: therefore it is called "the kingdom of heaven." All this is signified in his death, burial, and resurrection with Christ; or in his being born of water. Hence the necessity of being buried with Christ in water, that he may be born of water, that he may enjoy the renewal of the Holy Spirit, and be placed under the reign of favor.

All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment, not of procurement. Birth itself is not for procuring, but for enjoying the life possessed before birth. So in the analogy—no one is to be baptized, or to be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of *procuring* life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed. If the child is never born, all its sensitive powers and faculties cannot be enjoyed; for it is after birth that these are fully developed and feasted upon all the aliments and objects of sense in nature. Hence all that is *now* promised in the gospel can only be *enjoyed* by those who are born again and placed in the kingdom of heaven under all its influences. Hence the philosophy of that necessity which Jesus preached,—"Unless a man be born again he cannot discern—unless a man be born of water and Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.

But let no man think that in the act of being born, either naturally or metaphorically, the child purchases, procures, or merits either life or its enjoyments. He is only by his birth placed in circumstances favorable to the enjoyment of life and all that makes life a blessing. "To as many as received him, believing in his name, he granted the privilege of being children of God, who derive their birth not from

blood, nor from the desire of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God."

Renewing of the Holy Spirit.

"He has saved us," says the Apostle Paul, "by the bath of regeneration and *the renewing of the Holy Spirit*, which he poured on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by his favor, [in the bath of regeneration,] we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Thus, and not by works of righteousness, he has saved us. Consequently, being born of water and the renewing of the Holy Spirit are not works of merit or of righteousness, but only means of enjoyment. But this pouring out of the influences, this renewing of the Holy Spirit is as necessary as the bath of regeneration to the salvation of the soul, and to the enjoyment of the hope of heaven, of which the Apostle speaks. In the kingdom into which we are born of water, the Holy Spirit is as the atmosphere in the kingdom of nature—we mean that the influences of the Holy Spirit are as necessary to *the new life* as the atmosphere is to our animal life in the kingdom of nature. But on this topic we have said so much in our "*Extra Defended*," that to it we must refer our readers who are still inquisitive on the subject. All that is done in us before regeneration, God our father effects by *the word*, or the gospel as dictated and confirmed by his Holy Spirit. But after we are thus begotten and born by the Spirit of God—after our new birth, the Holy Spirit is shed on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; of which the peace of mind, the love, the joy, and the hope of the regenerate is full proof; for these are amongst the fruits of that Holy Spirit of promise of which we speak. Thus commences

The New Life.

"*Newness of life*" is a Hebraism for a *new life*. The new birth brings us into a new state. "Old things have passed away; all things have become new," says an Apostle: "for if any one be in Christ he is a new creature." A new spirit, a new heart, and an outward character corresponding to this change, are the effects of the regenerating process: "for the end of the charge," the grand result of the remedial system, is "love out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned." "Love is the fulfilling of the whole law," and the fruit of the whole gospel. It is the cardinal principle of all Christian behaviour, the soul of the new man, the breath of the new life. Faith works by no other rule. It is a working principle, and love is the rule by which it operates. The Spirit of God is the spirit of love and the health of a sound mind. Every pulsation of the new heart is the impulse of the spirit of love. Hence the brotherhood is beloved, and all mankind embraced in unbounded good will. When the tongue speaks, the hands and feet move and operate under the unrestrained guidance of this principle, we have the Christian character drawn to

the life. For meekness, humility, mercy, sympathy, and active benevolence, are only the names of the various workings of this all renovating, invigorating, sanctifying, and happifying principle. "He that dwells in love dwells in God and God in him."

The Christian, or the new man, is then a philanthropist to the utmost extent of the meaning of that word. Truth and love have made him free from all the tyrannies of passion, from guilt, and fear, and shame; have filled him with courage, active and passive. Therefore, his enterprize, his capital enterprize, to which all others minister, is to take part with the Saviour in the salvation of the world. "If by any means I may save some," are not the words of Paul only, but of every *new man.* Are they merchants, mechanics, husbandmen; are they magistrates, lawyers, judges, or unofficial citizens; are they masters, servants, fathers, sons, brothers, neighbors; whatever, or wherever they may be, they live for God and his city, for the King and his Empire. They associate not with the children of wrath—the miser, the selfish, the prodigal, the gay, the proud, the slanderer, the tattler, the rake, the libertine, the drunkard, the thief, the murderer. Every new man has left these precincts; has broken his league with Satan and his slaves, and has joined himself to the family of God. These he complacently loves, those he pities, and does good to all.

The character of the new man is an elevated character. Feeling himself a son and heir of God, he cultivates the temper, spirit, and behaviour, which correspond with so exalted a relation. He despises every thing mean, grovelling, earthly, sensual, devilish. As the only begotten and well beloved Son of God is to be the model of his future personal glory, so the character which Jesus sustained amongst men, is the model of his daily imitation. His every day aspiration is—

> "Thy fair example I would trace,
> To teach me what I ought to be;
> Make me by thy transforming grace,
> Lord Jesus, daily more like thee!"

The law of God is hid in his heart. The living oracles dwell in his mind; and he grows in favor with God as he grows in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ his Lord. As a newborn babe he desires the unadulterated milk of the word of God, that he may grow by it; for as the thirsty hart pants after the brooks of water, so pants his soul after God. Thus he lives to God, and walks with him. This is the character of the regenerate, of him that is born of God, of the new man in Christ Jesus. This is that change of heart, of life, and of character, which is the tendency and the fruit of the process of regeneration as taught and exemplified by the Apostles, and those commended by God, in their writings.

We now proceed to offer a few remarks on physical regeneration, the second part of our subject.—

Physical Regeneration.

Our mortal bodies are yet to feel the regenerating power of the Son of God. This is emphatically called "*the glory of his power.*" "The redemption of the body" from the bondage of corruption, is the consummation of the new-creating energy of him who has immortality. Life and incorruptibility were displayed in and by his resurrection from the dead. It was great to create man in the image of God, greater to redeem his soul from general corruption, but greatest of all to give to his mortal frame incorruptible and immortal vigor. The power displayed in the giving to the dead body of the Son of God incorruptible glory and endless life, is set forth by the Apostle Paul as incomparably surpassing every other divine work within the reach of human knowledge. He prays that the mind of Christians may be enlarged to apprehend this mighty power—that the Father of glory would open their minds, "that they might know the exceeding greatness of his power in relation to us who believe—according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." Faith in this wonderful operation of God—hope for the riches of the glory of the inheritance of the saints in light, are the most powerful principles of action which God has ever planted in the human breast. This is the transcendent hope of the Christian calling, which imparted such heroic courage to all the saints of eternal renown. This better resurrection in prospect, has produced heroes which make cowards of all the boasted chiefs of worldly glory. As the magnetic needle ever points to the pole, so the mind influenced by this hope ever rises to the skies, and terminates on the fulness of joy and the pleasures forevermore, in the presence and at the right hand of God.

To raise a dead body to life again, is not set forth as more glorious than by a touch to give new vigor to the palsied arm, to impart sight to the blind, or hearing to the deaf; but to give that raised body the deathless vigor of incorruptibility, to renovate and transform it in all its parts, and to make every spirit feel that it reanimates its own body, that is as insusceptible of decay, as immortal as the Father of eternity, is a thought overwhelming to every mind, a development which will glorify the power of God, as the sacrifice of his Son now displays his righteousness, faithfulness, and love to the heavens and to the earth.

This new birth from the dark prison of the grave, is fitly styled "the redemption of the body" from bondage, "*the glorious liberty of the sons of God.*" As in our watery grave the old man is figuratively buried to rise no more, so in the literal grave, the prison of the body, we leave all that is corrupt; for he that makes all things new will raise us up in his own likeness, and present us before his Father's face in all the glory of immortality. Then will regeneration be complete. Then will be the full revelation of the sons of God.

Immortality, in the sacred writings, is never applied to the spirit of man. It is not the doctrine of Plato which the resurrection of Jesus proposes. It is the *immortality of the body* of which his resurrection is a proof and pledge. This was never developed till he became the first born from the dead, and in a human body entered the heavens. Jesus was not a spirit when he returned to God. He is not made the Head of the New Creation as a Spirit, but as the Son of Man. Our nature in his person is glorified; and when he appears to our salvation, we shall be made like him: we shall then see him as he is. This is the Christian hope.

"A hope so great and so divine
May trials well endure,
And purify the soul from sense and sin,
As Christ himself is pure."

Thus matters stand in the economy of redemption. Thus the divine scheme of regeneration is consummated: the moral part, by the operation of moral means; the physical part, by the mighty power of God operating through physical means. By the word of his power he created the heavens and the earth; by the word of his grace he reanimates the soul of man; and by the word of his power he will again form our bodies anew, and reunite the spirit and the body in the bonds of an incorruptible and everlasting union. Then shall death "be swallowed up forever."

"Where now thy victory, boasting grave?"

But for this we must patiently wait. "We know not what we shall be." We only know, that when he appears we shall be like him; that we shall see him as he is.

The use of the Theory of Regeneration.

One would imagine, from the voluminous arguments, debates and sermons upon the theory of regeneration, that a sound theory was essential to salvation: that it must be preached in every sermon, in order to regenerate the hearers. Nothing can be more preposterous. Who can think that any theory of the resurrection or regeneration of the body, can affect the body in the grave! As little can any theory affect the unregenerate, or those dead in trespasses and in sins. A sermon upon generation, or upon natural birth, would be as efficacious upon those unborn in bringing them into this life, as a sermon upon moral or physical regeneration. This explains the fact, that in all the accounts of apostolical preaching to Jew and Gentile—in all the extracts of their sermons and speeches found in the New Testament, the subject of regeneration is not once mentioned. It is, in all the historic books of the New Testament, but once propounded, but once named; and that only in a private conference with a Jewish senator on the affairs of Christ's kingdom. No theory understood or believed by the unregenerate; no theory proposed to them for their acceptance, can avail any thing to their regeneration. We might as rea-

sonably deliver a theory of digestion to a dyspeptic, to cure his stomach—or a theory upon vegetation to a scion, to hasten its growth, as to preach any view of regeneration to a sinner, to make him a Christian.

Of what use, then, are the previous remarks on this subject? I will first candidly inform the reader, that they were not written for his regeneration, either of mind or body; but for the benefit of those who are employed in the work of regenerating others, and for the conviction of such Christians as may have been induced to regard us as aiming at nothing but the mere immersion of persons, as alone necessary to the whole process of conversion or regeneration, in their acceptation of these words.* The use of this theory, if it have any, is, as a guide to those who are laboring publicly or privately for the regeneration of sinners. If we have assigned a proper place to facts, testimony, faith, feeling, action, the bath of regeneration, the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and a new life, the course is fairly marked

*It may again be necessary in this fastidious age to remark, that in this essay, in order to disabuse the public mind on our use and acceptation of the term *regeneration*, we have taken the widest range which a supreme regard for the apostolic style could, in our judgment, allow. While we argue that the phrase *bath of regeneration* (Titus iii. 5.) is equivalent to *immersion*, as already explained, and as contradistinguished from *the renewing of the Holy Spirit*, of which the immersed believer is a proper subject; we have spoken of the whole process of renovation, not in the strict application of the phrase, Titus iii. 5. but rather in the whole latitude of the figure employed by the Apostle. It is not the first act of begetting, nor the last act of being born, but the whole process of conversion alluded to in the figure of *generation*, to which we have directed the attention of our readers. For, as often before stated, our opponents deceive themselves and their hearers by representing us as ascribing to the word *immersion* and the act of immersion all that they call *regeneration*. While, therefore, we contend that being "born again," and being immersed, are, in the Apostle's style, two names for the same action, we are far from supposing or teaching that in forming the new man there is nothing necessary but to be born.

If any ask why this matter was not fully developed in our first essays on this subject, our answer is, Because we could not anticipate that our opponents would have so represented or misrepresented our views. Were a General asked why he did not arrange all his troops in the beginning of the action as he had them arranged when he triumphed over his enemy, he would reply that the manœuvres and assaults of the enemy directed the disposition of his forces.

Our opponents contend for a regeneration begun and perfected before faith or baptism—a spiritual change of mind by the Holy Spirit antecedent to either knowledge, faith, or repentance, of which infants are as susceptible as adults; and therefore, as we contend, make the gospel of no effect. By way of reprisals they would have their converts to think that we go for nothing but water, and sarcastically call us the advocates of "water regeneration." They think there is something more sublime and divine in "spirit regeneration;" and therefore claim the title of orthodox. This calumny has been one occasion of the present essay, and it has occasioned that part of it which gives the fullest latitude to the term *regeneration*, which analogy gives to the figure used by the Apostle. But when we speak in the exact style of the living oracles on this subject, we must represent *being born again*, (John iii. 5.) and *regeneration*, (Titus iii. 5.) as relating to the act of immersion alone. See *Extra Defended*, pp. 24—36.

out. They are to present the great facts, to declare the whole testimony of God to sinners, in order to their conversion or regeneration. Like Paul, in his account of his labors in Corinth, they must go out. not in the strength of human philosophy, "*but declaring the testimony of God*," and laying before their hearers "the wonderful works of God."

This is the use, and the only proper use of sound theory on any subject. It is to guide the operator, not the thing operated upon. would hope, under the Divine blessing, to be the means of regenerating more persons in one year, never once naming regeneration, nor speculating upon the subject, by stating and enforcing the testimony of God, than by preaching daily the most approved theory of regeneration ever sanctioned by any sanhedrim on earth.* With these views we have, then, offered the preceding remarks; and shall now briefly turn our attention to

---

August 1st.—I have just now opened the Cincinnati *Baptist Journal* of 26th July, from which I read an approved definition of regeneration. It is orthodox, spiritual, physical, mystical, and metaphysical Regeneration. It is quoted from the "STANDARD." Regeneration, in the *Evangelical Standard,* is thus defined:—

"Is the sinner active in regeneration? Certainly he is. His mind is a thinking, rational principle, which never ceases to act; and therefore, when the word *passive* is applied to it, by Old Divines, or by Calvinists, they do not mean that it is *literally* dead, like inert matter, which requires a physical impulse to put it in motion. They only mean to convey the scriptural idea, that the Holy Spirit is the *sole* agent in regeneration, and that the sinner has no more *efficient agency* in accomplishing it, than Lazarus had in becoming alive from the dead. Still they grant that his mind is most active, but unhappily its activity is all *against* the Divine influence; as the Scriptures assure us, unregenerated persons 'do always resist' the strivings of the Spirit. '*Every* imagination of the thoughts of man's heart, is *only* evil continually.' 'There is none that doeth good, no *not one.*' The sinner, therefore, instead of voluntarily co-operating with the Holy Spirit, does all he can to *resist* his divine influence, and *prevent* his own regeneration, until he is *made* willing by almighty power."

What a comfortable thing is this theory of regeneration! The sinner is to be regenerated when actively striving against the Divine influence. At the moment of regeneration "he has," in one sense, "no more efficient agency in accomplishing it, than Lazarus had in becoming alive from the dead;" and in another sense, he is not passive, but "does all he can to *resist* the Divine influence, and *prevent* his own regeneration, until he is *made* willing by almighty power." This is *standard* divinity; and he that preaches this divinity, is a pious, regenerated, Regular Orthodox Baptist Christian Minister! How much value, on this theory, is all the preaching in Christendom? The Holy Spirit may be busily at work upon some drunken sot, or some vile debauchee, who is as dead as Lazarus on one side, and on the other resisting the Spirit, with all his moral and physical energy, up to the moment that the Almighty arm pierces him to the heart without a sword, and makes him alive by killing him!!!

The absurdity and licentiousness of such a view of the great work of renovation, we had thought so glaring, that no editor in the West would have had boldness to have published it. This is a proof of the necessity of our present essay, and will explain to the intelligent reader why we have given to the whole process of renovation the name of regeneration, which properly belongs to the last act.

The Regeneration of the Church.

The word *regeneration* we have found once used in the sense of a new state of things, or of the introduction of a new state of things. Matth. xix. 28. In this application of the word, we would turn the attention of our readers to the necessity of the regeneration of the church.

I speak not of the regeneration of any sectarian establishment. They are built upon another foundation—upon the foundation of decrees of councils, creeds, formularies, or acts of Parliament. But we speak of those societies that professedly build upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, without any human bond of union, or rule of life—our brethren of the reformation or regeneration now in process.

Should any one imagine that the state of things to which we have attained is the sole, or ultimate object of our aspirations, or our efforts, he would do us the greatest injury. Societies indeed may be found amongst us far in advance of others in their progress towards the ancient order of things; but we know of none that has fully attained to that model. It is, however, most acceptable to see so many societies formed and forming under the banners of reformation, with the determination to move onwards in conformity to the sacred oracles, till they stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

Our opponents cannot, or will not, understand how any society can be in progress to a better order of things than that under which they may have commenced their pilgrimage. Their sectarian policies were soon formed, and the limits of their reformation were soon fixed, beyond which it soon became heretical to move. The founders of all new schisms not only saw through a glass darkly, but their horizon was so circumscribed with human traditions, that they only aimed at moving a few paces from the hive in which they were generated. A new creed was soon adopted, and then their stature was complete. They bounded from infancy to manhood in a few days, and decided if any presumed farther to advance, they should be treated as those who had refused to move from the old hive. Hence it became as censurable to grow beyond a certain standard, as not to grow at all. This never was our proposition, and never can be our object. We have no new creed to form, no rules of discipline to adopt. We have taken the Living Oracles as our creed, our rules and measures of faith and practice; and in this department, have no additions, alterations, nor amendments to propose. But in coming up to this standard of knowledge, faith, and behaviour, we have something yet before us, to which we have not attained.

That we may be distinctly understood on this subject, we shall speak particularly on the things wanting in our individual characters, and of the things wanting in our church order, to give to our meetings that interest and influence which they ought to exert on the brotherhood and on society at large.

It will be understood, that our remarks on the things which are wanting in the disciples, are applicable not to every individual, but to the general mass. And first of all, there is wanting a more general and particular knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, than is possessed by the great majority of the reformers. There is, perhaps, wanting a taste or disposition for that private devotional reading of the oracles of God, which is so essential to a growth in that knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, which constitutes the most striking attribute in Christian character. We thus reason from the proficiency which is discoverable in the bounds of our acquaintance, which is large enough to afford data for very general conclusions.

To read the Scriptures for the sake of carrying out into practice all that we learn, and to read them for the sake of knowing what is written, are very different objects, and will produce very different results. Their influence on the temper and behaviour, in the former case, will very soon become manifest to all with whom we associate; while in the latter case, there is no visible improvement. David said that he "hid the word of God in his heart," or laid it up in his mind, "that he might not sin against God;" and that he had "more understanding than all his teachers, because God's testimonies were his meditation." It will be admitted that the sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, ought to be as precious and as delightful to the Christian, as were the ancient oracles to the most pious Jew. Now as an example of what we mean by a private devotional reading and study of the oracles of Christ, we shall permit a Jew to tell his experience——

"The law of thy mouth is better to me than thousands of gold and silver. With my whole heart have I sought thee; my soul breaketh for the longing that it has to thy judgments at all times. Thy testimonies are my delight and my counsellors. Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes, and I will keep it to the end. Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law; yes, I will observe it with my whole heart. Make me to go in the path of thy commandments, for in it do I delight. Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage. At midnight I will rise to give thanks to thee, because of thy righteous judgments. O how I love thy law; it is my meditation all the day! How sweet are thy words to my taste; sweeter than honey to my mouth! Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage forever, for they are the rejoicing of my heart. Great peace have they that love thy law, and nothing shall cause them to stumble."

These are only a few extracts from one piece, written by a king three thousand years ago. On another occasion he pronounced the following encomium on the testimony of God:—

"The law [doctrine] of the Lord is perfect, converting [restoring] the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true

and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey, and the honey-comb. By them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them there is a great reward."

This fully reveals all that we mean by a devotional private study of the Holy Scriptures. Every Christian who can read, may every day thus refresh, strengthen, and comfort his heart, by reading or committing to memory, and afterwards reflecting upon some portion of the book. He may carry in his pocket the blessed volume, and many a time through the day take a peep into it. This will preserve him from temptation, impart courage to his heart, give fluency to his tongue, and the graces of Christianity to his life.

In this age, when ignorance of the Christian Scriptures is so characteristic, and the rage for human opinions and traditions so rampant, it is a duty doubly imperative on our brethren, to give themselves much more to the study of the book, and then one of them will put a host of the aliens to flight; and, what is still more desirable, he will have communion with God all the day, and ever rejoice in his salvation.

In the second place, there is wanting amongst disciples who are heads of families, more attention, much more effort, to bring up their children "in the correction and instruction of the Lord." The children of all disciples should be taught the oracles of God from the first dawning of reason. The good seed should be sown in their hearts before the strong seeds of vice can take root. *From a child* Timothy knew the Holy Scriptures, and they were able to make him wise to salvation, through the Christian faith. How many more Timothys might we have, if we had a few more of the daughters of Lois, and a few more mothers like Eunice! Most saints, in this generation, appear more zealous that their children should shine on earth, than in heaven—and that they may be rich here, at the hazard of eternal bankruptcy. They labor to make them rich and genteel, rather than pure and holy; and spend more time in fashioning them to the foolish and wicked taste of *polished* society, than in teaching them by precept and example the word that is better than gold, and more precious than rubies. Well, they sow darnel, and cannot reap wheat. They may have a mournful harvest, and years of bitterness and sorrow may reward them for their negligence and error. If only a tithe of the time, and the labor, and expense that it costs to fit a son or a daughter to shine in the middle or front ranks of *genteel* society, were spent in teaching them to fear God and keep his commandments, how many more virtuous, solid and useful citizens—how many more valuable members of the family of God—how many more faithful and able witnesses for the truth of God, would be found in all corners of the land!

Every Christian family ought to be a nursery for God. Their offspring should be trained for the skies. For such are the promises of God, such are the facts on record, and such is the experience of Christians, that every parent who does his duty to his children, may

expect to see them inherit the blessing. Their didactic labors, aided by their example and their constant prayers, will seldom or never fail of success in influencing their descendants to walk in their ways. The very command to bring up their children in the Lord, implies its practicability. And both Testaments furnish us with all assurance that such laboas will not be vain. The men of high renown in sacred history, were generally the sons of such a parentage. The sons of God were found among the sons of Seth, while the daughters of men were of the progeny of Cain. Abraham was the descendant of Shem; Moses and Aaron were the sons of believing parents; Samuel was the son of Hannah, and David was the son of Jesse. John the Harbinger was the son of Zechariah and Elizabeth; and it pleased the heavenly Father, that his Son should be the child of a pious virgin.

But it is under Christ that the faithful are furnished with all the necessary means of bringing up their offspring for the Lord. The numerous failures which we witness, are to be traced either to great neglect, or to some fatal notion which paralyzes all effort; for some think that the salvation or damnation of their offspring was a matter settled from all eternity, irrespective of any agency on their part: that some are born "vessels of wrath," and others "vessels of mercy;" and hence the instructions, examples and prayers of parents, are of no avail. Among the descendants of such, it will no doubt often happen that some *become* vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, while others *become* vessels of mercy, predestined to glory.

When God gave a revelation to Jacob, and commanded a law to Israel, he gave it in charge that they "should teach it to their children, that they might *put their trust in God*, and might not be, like their fathers, a rebellious race." The Apostles of Christ have also taught the Christians the same lesson. This is our guide, and not our own reasonings. Now let the disciples make this their business, morning, noon, and evening, and then we shall see its effects.

We are sorry to see this great duty, to which nature, reason, revelation alike direct, so much neglected by many of our brethren; to find amongst their children those who are no better acquainted with the Scriptures than the children of their neighbors who believe in miraculous conversions, or think it a sin to attempt what they imagine to be the work of God alone—never suspecting that God works by human means, and employs human agency in his works of providence and redemption

I never knew but a very few families that made it their daily business to train up their children in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, to cause them every day to commit to memory a portion of the living oracles; but these few instances authorize me to think, and to say, that such a course persisted in, and sustained by the good example of parents, will very generally, if not universally, issue in the salvation of their children. And before any one says, I have found an exception to the proverb of Solomon which says "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from

it,"—let him show that this child was trained up "*in the way he should go.*"

In the third place, there is wanting among many disciples a stricter regard to relative duties—we mean, not only the dues which justice, truth, and moderation claim, but *all* relative duties. So long as Christians live after the manner of men in the flesh, according to the fashion of this world, they must, like other men, contract debts which they cannot promptly pay, make covenants and bargains, give promises which they cannot fulfil, and stake pledges which they are unable to redeem. All this is wholly incompatible with our profession. Such were not the primitive disciples. Sceptics of every name, men of the world, who have ever read the New Testament, know that such behaviour is utterly incompatible with the letter and spirit of Christianity. A Christian's word or promise ought to be, and is, if Christ be honored, as solemn and as obligatory as any bond. And as for breach of bargain or covenant, even where it is greatly or wholly to the disadvantage of the Christian, it is not even to be thought of—"he changes not, though to his hurt he covenants." How much has the gospel lost of its influence, because of the faithlessness of its professors! O when shall it be again said of Christians in general, that "they bind themselves as with a solemn oath, not to commit any kind of wickedness—to be guilty neither of theft, robbery, nor adultery—*never to break a promise*, or to keep back a deposit when called upon." Pliny writes to the Emperor Trajan that such was the character of Christians A. D. 106—7, as far as he could learn it from those who were not Christians. Were all the common (now-a-days rather *uncommon*) virtues of justice, truth, fidelity, honesty, practised by all Christians, how many mouths would be stopped, and how many new arguments in favor of Jesus Christ could all parties find! But even were these common virtues as general as the Christian profession, there are the other finer virtues of benevolence, goodness, mercy, sympathy, which belong to the profession, expressed in taking care of the sick, the orphan, the widow—in alleviating all the afflictions of our fellow-creatures. Add these virtues, or *graces*, as we sometimes call them, to the others, and then how irresistible the argument for the divine authenticity of the gospel! Let industry, frugality, temperance, honesty, justice, truth, fidelity, humility, mercy, sympathy, appear conspicuous in the lives of the disciples, and the contest between them and other professors will plead their cause more successfully than a hundred preachers.

In the last place, there is wanting a more elevated piety to bring up the Christian character to the standard of primitive times. We want not fine speeches nor eloquent orations on the excellencies of Christian piety and devotion. These are generally acknowledged. But we need to be roused from our supiness, from our worldly-mindedness, from our sinful conformities to an apostate generation, to the exhibition of that holiness in speech, in behaviour, without which no one shall see the Lord. What mean the numerous exhortations of the Apostles to watchfulness and prayer, if these are not essential to our devotion to God and consecration to his service?

If our affections are not placed on things above, we are unfit for the kingdom of glory. To see the folly of a profession of Christianity without the power of godliness, we have only to put the question, How is that person fit for the enjoyment of God and Christ, whose heart is filled with the cares, anxieties, and concerns of this life—whose whole life is a life of labor and care for the body—a life of devotion to the objects of time and sense? No man can serve God and Mammon. Where the treasure is the heart must also be. Thither the affections turn their course. There is no room for the residence of the Spirit of God in a mind devoted to the affairs of this life. The spirit of the policies of this world and the Spirit of God cannot dwell in the same heart. If Jesus or his Apostles taught any one doctrine clearly, fully, and unequivocally, it is this doctrine, that "the cares of this world, the lusts of other things, and the deceitfulness of riches, stifle the word and render it unfruitful."

If any one would enjoy the power of godliness, he must give up his whole soul to it. The business of this life will be performed religiously as a duty subordinate to the will of God. While his hands are engaged in that business which his own wants, or those of his household make necessary, his affections are above. He delights in God, and communes with him all the day. A Christian is not one who is pious by fits and starts, who is religious or devout on one day of the week, or for one hour of the day. It is the whole bent of his soul—it is the beginning, middle, and end of every day. To make his calling and election sure is the business of his life. His mind rests only in God. He places the Lord always before him. This is his joy and his delight. He would not for the world have it otherwise. He would not enjoy eternal life, if he had it at his option, in any other way than that which God himself has proposed. He accedes to God's arrangements, not of necessity, but of choice. His religious services are perfect freedom. He is free indeed. The Lord's commandments are not grievous, but joyful. The yoke of Christ is to him easy and his burthen light. He will sing with David—

The love that to thy laws I bear,
  No language can display;
They with fresh wonders entertain
  My ravish'd thoughts all day.

The law that from thy mouth proceeds
  Of more esteem I hold
Than untouch'd mines, than thousand mines
  Of silver and of gold.

Whilst in the way of thy commands,
  More solid joy I found,
Than had I been with vast increase
  Of envy'd riches crown'd.

Thy testimonies I have kept,
  And constantly obey'd;
Because the love I bore to them
  Thy service easy made.

In the same ratio as Christians devoutly study the oracles of God, teach them to their children, practise all relative duties to society at large, and rise to a more elevated piety, they will increase their influence in the great and heavenly work of regenerating the world.

A few remarks on the things wanting in the order of Christian assemblies, to give to their public meetings that influence on themselves and on society at large, will finish this section of our essay.

Our heavenly Father wills our happiness in all his institutions. His ordinances are, therefore, the surest, the simplest, and the most direct means of promoting our happiness. The Lord Jesus gave himself for the church that he might purify and bless it; and, therefore, in the church are all the institutions which can promote the individual and social good of the Christian community. In attending upon these institutions on the Lord's day much depends upon the preparation of heart of all who unite in commemorating the death and resurrection of the Son of God.

In adverting to the most scriptural and rational manner of celebrating or observing the day to the Lord, and for our own comfort and the regeneration of the world, we would first of all remark, that much depends upon the frame of mind, or preparation of heart, in which we visit the assemblies of the saints.

Suppose two persons, A and B, if you please, members of the same church, taking their seats together at the Lord's table. A, from the time he opened his eyes in the morning, was filled with the recollections of the Saviour's life, death, and resurrection. In his closet, in his family, and along the way he was meditating or conversing on the wonders of redemption, and renewing his recollections of the sayings and doings of the Messiah. B, on the other hand, arose as on other days, and finding himself free from all obligations arising from the holiness of time, talks about the common affairs of every day, and allows his thoughts to roam over the business of the last week, or, perhaps, to project the business of the next. If he meet with a neighbor, friend, or brother, the news of the day is inquired after, expatiated upon, discussed; the crops, the markets, the public health, or the weather—the affairs of Europe, or the doings of Congress, or the prospects of some candidate for political honor, become the theme of conversation. As he rides or walks to the church, he chats upon all, or any of these topics, till he enter the door of the meeting house. Now as A and B enter the house in very different states of mind, may it not be supposed that they will differ as much in their enjoyments as in their morning thoughts? Or can B, by a single effort, unburthen his mind, call in the wanderings of his thoughts, and in a moment transport himself from the contemplation of things on earth to things in heaven? If this can be imagined, then meditation and preparation of heart are wholly unnecessary to the acceptable worship of God, and to the comfortable enjoyment of his institutions.

But is it compatible with experience, or is it accordant to reason that B can delight in God, and rejoice in commemorating the wonders of his redemption, while his thoughts are dissipated upon the mountains

of a thousand vanities?—while, like a fool's eyes, his thoughts are roaming to the ends of the earth! Can he say, with a pious Jew, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longs—yes, even faints, for the courts of the Lord! My heart and my flesh cry out for the living God. Happy they who dwell in thy house; they will be still praising thee! A day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of wickedness."—"One thing have I desired of the Lord, and that I will seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple. O send out thy light and thy truth! Let them lead me, let them bring me to thy holy hill and to thy tabernacles. Then will I go to the altar of God, to God my exceeding joy; yes, I will praise thee, O God, my God!"

Or had the Jew a sublimer worship, more exalted views of God's salvation, and more piety than a Christian? Or were the ordinances of the Jewish sanctuary more entertaining and refreshing than the ordinances of the Christian church? This will not be alleged; consequently, B, and all of that school, are utterly at fault when they approach the house of God in such a state of mind as they approach the market place, the forum, or the common resorts of this present world.

Christians need not say in excuse for themselves, that all days are alike, that all places and times are alike holy, and that they ought to be in the best frame of mind all the time. For even concede them all their own positions, they will not contend that a man ought to speak to God, or to come into the presence of God, as they approach men. They will not say that they ought to have the same thoughts and feelings in approaching the Lord's table, as in approaching a common table; or on entering a court of political justice, as in coming into the house of God. There is, in the words of Solomon the Wise, a season and time for every object and for every work:—There is the Lord's day, the Lord's table, the Lord's house, and the Lord's people; and there are thoughts, and frames of mind, and behaviour compatible and incompatible with all these.

In the public assembly the whole order of worship ought to do justice to what is passing in the minds of all the worshippers. That joy in the Lord, that peace and serenity of mind, that affection for the brethren, that reverence for the institutions of God's house, which all feel, should be manifest in all the business of the day. Nothing that would do injustice to all or any of these, ought ever to appear in the congregation of Jesus Christ our Lord. No levity, irreverence, no gloom, no sadness, no pride, no unkindness, no severity of behaviour towards any, no coldness, nothing but love, and peace, and joy, and humility, and reverence should appear in the face, in the word, or action of any disciple.

These are not little matters. They all exert a salutary influence on the brethren and the strangers. These are visible and sensible displays of the temper and spirit of Christians; and if Paul thought it

expedient to write of *veils* and *long hair* when admonishing a church "to do all things decently and in order," we, in this day of degeneracy, may be allowed to notice matters and things as minute as those before us.

We intend not now to go into the details of church order or Christian discipline, nor to expatiate on the necessity of devoting a part of the time to singing, praying, reading, teaching, exhorting, commemorating, communicating; nor on how much of this or that is expedient. Times and circumstances must decide how much time shall be taken up in these exercises, and when it shall be most fitting to meet, to adjourn, &c. Nor is it necessary now to say, that there must be simply order, and presidency, and proper discipline, and due subordination to one another in the fear of God. We now speak rather of the *manner* in which all things are to be done, than of the things themselves, their necessity or value.

After noticing what in some instances appears to be wanting in the manner of coming together on the Lord's day, we proceed to notice in order the things wanting in many congregations for the purposes already specified.

And first of all, be it observed, that in some churches there appears to be wanting *a proper method of handling the Scriptures to the edification of the brethren.* It is admitted by all the holy brethren that the Scriptures of truth, called *the living oracles*, are the great instrument of God for all his purposes in the saints on earth. Through them they are converted to God, comforted, consecrated, made meet for an inheritance among the sanctified, and qualified for every good word and work. Every thing, then, depends upon the proper understanding of these volumes of inspiration. They can only operate as far as they are understood.

The system of sermonizing on a text is now almost universally abandoned by all who intend that their hearers should understand the testimony of God. Orators and exhorters may select a word, a phrase, or a verse; but all who feed the flock of God with knowledge and understanding, know that this method is wholly absurd. Philological lectures upon a chapter are only a little better. The discussion of any particular topic, such as faith, repentance, election, the Christian calling, may sometimes be expedient; but in a congregation of Christians the reading and examining the different books in regular succession, every disciple having the volume in his hand, following up the connexion of things, examining parallel passages, interrogating and being interrogated, fixing the meaning of particular words and phrases by comparison with the style of that writer or speaker, or with that of others; intermingling these exercises with prayer and praises, and keeping the narrative, the epistle, or the speech, so long before the minds of all, as is necessary for the youngest disciple in the congregation to understand it, and to become deeply interested in it, will do more in one year than is done in many on the plan of the popular meetings of the day.

Great attention should be paid to all the allusions, in any composition, to the peculiarities of time, place, and circumstance, to the geographical, historical, and chronological particulars of all questions of fact connected with all persons of note in the narratives: for these are often the best interpreters of style and expositors of the meaning of what is written.

This searching, examining, comparing, and ruminating upon the Holy Scriptures in private, in the family, in the congregation, cannot fail to make us learned in the knowledge of God, and in the knowledge of men. The Bible contains more real learning than all the volumes of men. It instructs us in all our natural, moral, political, and religious relations. Though it teaches us not astronomy, medicine, chemistry, mathematics, architecture, it gives us all that knowledge which adorns and dignifies our moral nature, and fits us for happiness. Happy the person who meditates upon it day and night! He grows and flourishes in moral health and vigor, as the trees upon the water courses. His leaf never fades—his fruit never fails.

The congregations of the saints want system in furthering their knowledge of this book. The simple reading of large portions in a desultory manner, is not without some good effect; for there is light, and majesty, and life in all the oracles of God: no man can listen to them without edification. But the profit accruing from such readings is not a tithe of that which might be obtained in the proper systematic reading and examination of them. The congregation is the school of Christ, and every pupil there should feel that he has learned something every day he waits upon his Master. He must take the Master's book with him, and, like every other good and orderly pupil, he must open it and study it with all the helps which the brotherhood, his school-fellows, can furnish for his more comprehensive knowledge of all its salutary communications.

A Christian scribe, well instructed in its contents, or a plurality of such, who can bring out of their intellectual treasury things new and old, will greatly advance the students in this heavenly science; but in the absence of such the students must be self-taught; and self-taught scholars are generally the best taught: for they cannot progress unless they study with diligence and carefully learn the rudiments of every science.

To give some idea of the diligence and attention to the minutest matters, which are necessary to proficiency in the knowledge of all that is written in the New Testament, we shall suppose that the disciples have for their lesson on some particular day the Nativity of the Messiah. The second chapter of Matthew is read. After reading this chapter, or the whole of the first section of Matthew's Testimony, the elder or president for the day asks some brother, a good reader, to read what the other evangelists have testified on this subject. Mark and John being silent on the nativity, he reads Luke, 2d section, 2d chapter, from the 1st to tho 41st verse. After the reading of this chapter, the following points are the subjects of inquiry, and most of them are proposed to the brethren for solution:—

1. Who was Cesar Augustus, and over what people did he reign?
2. At what period of his reign was the edict for enrolment issued, or when did the first register take effect?
3. What did Syria include, and what were its boundaries?
4. Who presided over Syria at the time of the first register?
5. Who was king in Judea at this time?
6. How far did Judea extend, or in what part of the Holy Land was it situate?
7. In what country was Jerusalem, where situated, and by what other names was it known?
8. What was the native city of Joseph?
9. Where was Nazareth situated, and in what district?
10. What was the boundary of Galilee, and what were its principal towns?
11. In what canton or district was Bethlehem, and how far from Jerusalem?
12. Who were the magians?
13. Why was 'Herod alarmed, and all Jerusalem with him,' when the magians reported the Star in the East?
14. What were the scribes and chief priests assembled by Herod, and why were they called together?
15. By what means did they decide the questions referred to them?
16. On what Prophet do they rely, and where shall the quotation be found?
17. Of what family and lineage was Joseph and Mary?
18. What does "betrothed" mean?
19. By what means did the magians find the house in which the Messiah was born?
20. Why did the magians not return to Herod?
21. Whether did the shepherds of Bethlehem or the eastern magians first pay their respects to the Messiah?
22. In what quarter of the globe does Egypt lie?
23. How far from Bethlehem?
24. How long was the Messiah kept in Egypt?
25. Who predicted his return from Egypt, and where shall it be found?
26. Who foretold the slaughter of the male infants in Bethlehem, and what instigated Herod to this cruel massacre?
27. Who succeeded Herod in the throne of Judea?
28. Why did Joseph retire to Nazareth?
29. What Prophet foretold this circumstance, and where shall it be found?

These matters being all ascertained, to which the maps, geographical and chronological indexes, and the appendix to the Family Testament will greatly contribute, some moral reflections will naturally occur; for in all these incidents are manifest the wisdom, care, and economy of our heavenly Father, his faithfulness, condescension, and love; the great variety of his instruments, and agents; the ease with which he frustrates the evil counsels and machinations of his enemies;

the infallible certainty of his foreknowledge; the perfect free agency of men, good and evil; the deep humiliation of his only begotten Son in all the circumstances of his nativity. Irresistible arguments in favor of his pretensions may be drawn from these ancient prophecies, from their minuteness of time, place, and circumstance; many eloquent and powerful lessons on human pride, vanity, and arrogance may be deduced from the birth-place, cradle, and family connexions of the Heir of the Universe; and many other touching appeals to the heart, which the birth, circumcision, and dedication of the Messiah, with all the incidents in Bethlehem, in Jerusalem, and the Temple, connected with his first appearance on earth furnish, will present themselves with unfading freshness and beauty to the brotherhood of Christ.

A hint to the wise is sufficient. Were this method pursued only two hours every Lord's day, every disciple giving his heart to the work; and were the results then compared with the products of the scrap Doctors, or sermonizers to sleeping and dreaming hearers, no man, having any regard for his reputation for good sense, could give his vote for the popular system.

A reformation in the manner of handling the living oracles is much wanting; and the sooner and more generally it is attempted, the greater will be the regenerating influence of the brotherhood on the world. Intelligent in the Holy Scriptures, clothed with the armor of light, every disciple going forth will be a David against the Philistines—a host against the armies of the aliens. And better still, the words of heavenly favor dwelling in his heart, he will carry with him into every society a fragrance like the rose of Sharon—a sweetness of perfume like a garden which the Lord has blessed.

There appears to be wanting in some congregations a proper attention to discipline, and a due regard to decorum, in the management of such cases as do occur. In every family, and in every congregation, there is occasional need of discipline. Offences, delinquencies, and apostacies, did occur in the congregations over which the apostles either were, or had been, presidents; and they will happen again in this state of discipline and trial in which we are all placed. They must be expected; and every congregation ought be prepared to act upon the emergency with intelligence and decorum. Much injury has been done to the progress of churches, by a remissness in attention to such cases, and in the manner they have been disposed of when taken up.

Nothing can be more preposterous and revolting to every sentiment of good order and decorum, than that every offender and offence should at the very offset be dragged into the public assembly. Persons who have the care of a congregation, the seniors whose age and experience have taught them prudence, ought to be first informed of such cases; and they ought not to lay a case before the congregation till they have prepared it for the action of the congregation. Every novice is not to feel himself at liberty to disturb the congregation by presenting, on his own responsibility and at his own discretion, a

complaint against a brother, whether it be of a public or private nature.

But we are now speaking of the *manner* of procedure in such cases. The most tender regard for the feelings of all, the utmost sympathy for the offender, the most unyielding firmness in applying the correctives which the Head of the church has commanded, and the necessity of acting promptly in accordance with the law in the case, are matters of much importance.

No passion, no partiality, no bad feeling—nothing but love and piety, but faithfulness and truth; nothing but courtesy and gentleness, should ever appear in the house of God. And when any one is found guilty and excluded from the society, it should be done with all solemnity, and with prayer that the institution of Christ may be a blessing to the transgressor.

But evil-doers, or those who act not honorably according to the law of Christ, ought not to be tolerated in the professed family of God. Such persons are a dead weight on the whole society—spots in every feast of love, and blemishes upon the whole profession. One sinner destroys much good: yet separation or abscission, like amputation, is only to be used in the last stage, when all other remedies, of remonstrance and admonition, expostulation and entreaty, have failed. To prevent gangrene, or an injury to the whole body, amputation is a necessary, an indispensable remedy. More strictness, more firmness, and more tenderness in such cases, would add greatly to the moral influence of every society. A few persons walking together in the bonds of Christian affection, and under the discipline of Christ, is better than the largest assembly in which there are visibly and manifestly many who fear not God, and keep not his commandments.

In the house of God all should be purity, reverence, meekness, brotherly kindness and love. Confidence in the honesty and sincerity of our brethren, is the life of communion. To feel ourselves united with them who are determined for eternal life, and resolved to seek first of all, chief of all, above all, the kingdom of heaven and the righteousness required in it, is most animating, comforting, exhilarating. But to be doubtful whether we are uniting with a mass of ignorance, corruption, and apathy, is as rottenness in the bones; love waxes cold, and then we have the form, without the power of godliness.

That the church may have a regenerating influence upon society at large, there is wanting a fuller display of Christian philanthropy in all her public meetings; care for the poor manifested in the liberality of her contributions; the expression of the most unfeigned sympathy for the distresses of mankind, not only among the brotherhood, but among all men; and an ardent zeal for the conversion of sinners proportioned to her professed appreciation of the value of her own salvation, and to her resources and means of enlightening the world on the things unseen and eternal. The full display of these attributes are the most efficient means of causing the gospel to sound abroad, and to achieve new conquests amongst our fellow citizens.

The Christian health and vigor of every church is to be estimated more by her exertions and success in bringing sinners home to God, than by all her other attainments. Too long has it been considered the duty, the almost exclusive duty of the preacher, to convert the world. He must spend his time and wear out his constitution in journeyings and preachings, while the individual members of the church are to mind their own business, seek their own wealth and domestic comfort. He must endure the heat and the cold, forsake his wife and family and commit the management of his affairs to others, while they have only to look on and pray for his success. Strange infatuation! Has he received a commission from the skies—has he been drafted out of the ranks to go to war, and they all left at home to take care of their wives and children! Some may believe this—some may imagine that it is his duty alone, to spend his time and his talents in this work, and theirs daily to labor for their own interest and behoof; but surely such are not the views and feelings of our brethren!

The work of the Lord will never progress—or in other words, the regenerating influence of the church will amount to little or nothing, so long as it is thought to be not equally the duty of every member, but the special duty of one or two, denominated preachers, to labor for the Lord.

There is either a special call, a general call, or no call at all, to labor for the conversion of the world. If there be a few specially called, the rest have nothing to do but to mind their own concerns; "to seek their own things, and not the things of Jesus Christ." If none be called, then it is the duty of none, and the Lord has nothing for his people to do—no world to convert; or, at least, nothing for them to do in that work. None of us are prepared for the consequences of either of these assumptions. It follows, then, that it is the duty of all to labor according to their respective abilities in this work. All are called to labor for the Lord. I hold that every citizen in Christ's kingdom is bound to take up arms for the King, as much as I am; and if he cannot go to fight the battles of the Lord, he must take care of the wives and children of those who can, and who will fight for their King and country. But the expense of the war must be borne by the subjects of the crown; and as the Lord will not have any tax-gatherers in his kingdom, but accepts only voluntary contributions, he makes a mark over against the names of those who do nothing, and he will settle with them at his return. He calls even the contributions for the gospel made by those at home, "a fragrant odor, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God."

But we are afraid of doing any thing of this sort, lest we should be like some other people, who we think have acted imprudently. Strange, indeed, that when any thing has been once abused, it is never again to be used! But I have inadvertently strayed off from my purpose. The manner in which the brethren labor for the salvation of the world, is all that comes within our prescribed limits. On this, enough has been said. Let the brethren solemnly consider the things

that are wanting to give to their meetings that influence which they ought to exert upon themselves and upon society at large.

We are as susceptible of receiving moral and religious advantages from our own good order and decorum in the congregation, as those who attend our meetings as spectators. And in this instance, as well as in all the variety of doing good, he that waters others is again watered in return; for he that blesses others, is always blessed in blessing them. None enjoy the blessings of the gospel more fully than they who are most active and influential in blessing others. What happy seasons are those in which we see many turning to the Lord! Now if we would have a perpetual feast, we must be perpetually devoted to the promotion of the happiness of others. We must live for God, as well as live to God.

In filling up these outlines, other matters still more minute, but perhaps equally important, will present themselve to the attention of the brethren. Now we cannot set about these matters too soon. The time has again come, when judgment must begin at the house of God. The people who have long enjoyed the word of life and the Christian institutions, must soon come to a reckoning. They must give an account of their stewardship, for the Lord has promised to call them to judgment. An era is just at the door, which will be known as *the Regeneration* for a thousand years to come. The Lord Jesus will judge that adulterous brood, and give them over to the burning flame, who have broken the covenant, and formed alliances with the governments of the earth. Now the cry is heard in our land, "Come out of her, my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you may not receive of her plagues." The Lord Jesus will soon rebuild Jerusalem, and raise up the tabernacle of David which has so long been in ruins. Let the church prepare herself for the return of her Lord, and see that she make herself ready for his appearance.

The Regeneration of the World.

All the kingdoms of this world shall soon become the kingdoms of our Lord the King. He will hurl all the present potentates from their thrones. He will grind to power the despotisms, civil and ecclesiastic, and with the blast of his mouth give them to the four winds of heaven. The antichristian power, whether it be called Papistical, Mahomedan, Pagan, or Atheistic, will as certainly be destroyed as Jesus reigns in heaven. No trace of them shall remain. The best government on earth, call it English or American, has within it the seeds of its own destruction—carries in its constitution a millstone which will sink it to the bottom of the sea. They acknowledge not that God has set his Christ upon his throne. They will not kiss the Son. Society under their economy is not blessed. The land mourns through the wickedness of those who sit in high places. Ignorance, poverty, and crime abound, because of the injustice and iniquities of those who guide the destinies of nations. Men that fear not God,

that love not his Son, and that regard not the maxims of his government, yet wear the sword, and sway the sceptre in all lands.

This is wholly adverse to the peace and happiness of the world. Therefore, he will break them to pieces like a potter's vessel, and set up an order of society in which justice, inflexible justice shall have uncontrolled dominion. Jesus will be universally acknowledged by all the race of living men, and all nations shall do him homage. This state of society will be the consummation of the Christian religion in all its moral influences and tendencies upon mankind.

How far this change is to be effected by moral, and how far by physical means, is not the subject of our present inquiry. But the preparation of a people for the coming of the Lord must be the result of the restoration of the ancient gospel and order of things. And come when it may, the day of the regeneration of the world will be a day as wonderful and terrible as was the day of the deluge, of Sodom's judgment, or of Jerusalem's catastrophe. Who shall stand when the Lord does this? But all the regenerations, physical and moral, individual, congregational, or national, are but types and shadows, or means of preparation for the

Regeneration of the Heavens and the Earth.

The Bible begins with the generations of the heavens and the earth; but the Christian revelation ends with the regeneration or new creation of the heavens and the earth. This is the ancient promise of God, confirmed to us by the Christian Apostles. The present elements are to be changed by fire. The old or antediluvian earth was purified by water; but the present earth is reserved for fire, with all the works of man that are upon it. It shall be converted into a lake of liquid fire. But the dead in Christ will have been regenerated in body before the old earth is regenerated by fire. The bodies of the saints will be as homogeneous with the new earth and heavens as their present bodies are with the present heavens and earth. God recreates, regenerates, but annihilates nothing; and therefore the present earth is not to be annihilated. The best description which we can give of this regeneration, is in the words of one who had a vision of it on the island of Patmos. He describes it as far as is connected with the New Jerusalem, which is to stand upon the new earth, under the canopy of the new heaven. As the natural close of our essay on regeneration, we shall transcribe the picture of this new earth and the New Jerusalem, drawn by the direction of that Spirit to whom the future is as intelligible as the past:—

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the former heaven and the former earth were passed away; and the sea was no more. And I, John, saw the holy city, the New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, prepared like a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall pitch his tent among them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be among them—their God. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor grief, nor crying; nor shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."——

"And he brought me in the Spirit to a great and high mountain; and he showed me the city, the holy Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God; (its lustre was like to that of a precious gem, even as a jasper stone, clear as crystal;) having a great and high wall; having also twelve gates, and over the gates twelve angels, and names written upon them, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel: on the east, three gates; on the north, three gates; on the south, three gates; and on the west, three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations; and on them the names of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb. And he that spoke with me had a golden reed that he might measure the city, and its gates, and wall. And the city is square, and its length is equal to its breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs; and its length, and its breadth, and its height are equal. And he measured its wall, one hundred and forty-four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of an angel. And the wall was built of jasper, and the city was pure gold, like refined glass. And the foundations of the walls of the city were adorned with every precious stone. The first foundation is jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, chalcedony; the fourth, emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, crysolite; the eighth beryl; the ninth, topaz; the tenth, chrysoprasus; the eleventh, hyacinth; and the twelfth, amethyst. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls: each of the gates was of one pearl. And the street of the city was pure gold, like transparent glass. And I saw no temple in it, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it; for the glory of the Lord enlightened it, and the Lamb is the light of it. And the nations of the saved shall walk in its light; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and their honor into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut by day, (for there shall be no night there.) And they shall bring the glory and the honor of the nations into it. And nothing unclean shall enter into it, nor any thing which practises abomination and falsehood; but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life."——

"And he showed me a river of water of life, clear as crystal, issuing out of the throne of God, and of the Lamb. In the midst of the broad street, and on each side of the river, was the tree of life, producing twelve kinds of fruit—producing its fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations. And every curse shall cease. And the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face; and his name shall be borne upon their foreheads. And there shall be no more night; and they have no need of a lamp, nor of the light of the sun; because the Lord God shall enlighten them; and they shall reign forever and ever."

A Word to the Moral Regenerators of this Age.

God, our heavenly Father, works by means, as we all confess. His means are wisely adapted to the ends he has in view. His agents are the best agents for the work he has to accomplish. He employs not physical means nor agents for moral ends and purposes. Nor does he produce physical effects by moral means and agents. He has been pleased to employ not angels, but men in the work of regenerating the world. Men have written, printed, and published the gospel for nearly two thousand years. They have perpetuated it from generation to generation. They have translated it from language to language, and carried it from country to country. They have preached it in word and in deed, and thus has it come down to our days.

During the present administration of the Reign of Heaven no change is to be expected; no new mission is to be originated, no new order of preachers is to be instituted. The King has gone to a far country, and before his departure he called together his servants, and committed to them the management of his estate till he return. He has not yet come to reckon with them. They were commanded first to proclaim the doctrine of his reign; then to write it in a book, and to commit it to faithful men who should be able to teach it correctly to others. By these faithful men the records have been kept; and through their vigilance and industry they have been guarded from corruption, interpolation, and change. One generation handed them over to the next; and if ignorant and unfaithful copyists neglected their duty, others more faithful have corrected them; and now we are able to hear the words which Jesus spoke, and to read the very periods penned by the Apostles.

Thus whatever the Prophets and the Apostles have achieved since their death, has been accomplished by human agents like ourselves. Where men have not carried this intelligence in speech or writing, not one of our race knows God or his anointed Saviour. No angel nor Holy Spirit has been sent to the Pagan nations: and God has exerted no power out of his word to enlighten or reclaim savage nations. These indisputable facts and truths have much moral meaning, and ought to give a strong impulse to our efforts to regenerate the world.

The best means of doing this is the object now before us; and this is one, the importance of which cannot be easily exaggerated. There are three ways of proceeding in this case, which now seem to occupy a considerable share of public attention. These are properly called *theorizing*, *declaiming*, and *preaching;* on each of which we may offer a remark or two in passing.

The *theorizers* are those who are always speculating upon correct notions, or the true theory of conversion. They are great masters of method, and with some of them it is a ruinous error to place faith before regeneration, or repentance after faith. Heresy, with these, is the derangement of the method which they have proposed for God to work by in converting the sinner. And the true faith which is connected with salvation is apprehension of this theory and acquiescence in it. These are all theorists, heady, or speculative Christians; and with them the whole *scheme* of redemption is a splendid theory. These are all cold-hearted and light-headed Christians. "Take off their heads," as a Methodist declaimer once said, "and you have got all their religion!"

Our maxim is, *Theory for the Doctors, and medicine for the sick:* Doctors fatten on theories, but the patients die who depend on theory for cure. A few grains of practice is worth a pound of theory. The mason and the carpenter *build* the house by *rule;* but he that inhabits it *lives* by *eating* and *drinking*. No man ever was cured physically, politically, morally, or religiously by learning a correct theory of his physical, political, moral, or religious malady. As soon might we expect to heal an ulcer on the liver by a discourse upon that organ, its

functions, its diseases, and their cure, as to restore a sinner by means of the theory of faith, repentance, regeneration, or effectual calling. But on this enough has already been said, and more than is necessary to convince those who can think, and who dare to reason on such themes.

The *declaimers* are not those only who eulogize virtue and reprobate vice; but that large and respectable class who address themselves to the passions, to the hopes and fears of men. They are those who are so rhetorical upon the joys of heaven and the terrors of hell: who horrify, terrify, and allure by the strength of their descriptions, the flexions of their voices, the violence of their gestures, and their touching anecdotes. Their hearers are either dissolved in tears or frantic with terror. These talk much about the heart; and on their theory if a man's heart was extracted all his religion would be extracted with it. The religion of their converts flows in their blood, and has its foundation in their passions.

The *preachers*, properly so called, first address themselves to the understanding by a declaration or narrative of the wonderful works of God. They state, illustrate, and prove the great facts of the gospel; they lay the whole record before their hearers; and when they have testified what God has done, what he has promised, and threatened, they exhort their hearers on these premises, and persuade them to obey the gospel, to surrender themselves to the guidance and direction of the Son of God. They address themselves to the whole man, his understanding, his will and his affections, and approach the heart by taking the citadel of the understanding.

The accomplished and wise proclaimer of the word will find it always expedient to address his audience in their proper character; to approach them through their prejudices, and never to find fault with those prepossessions which are not directly opposed to the import and design of the ministry of reconciliation. He will set before them the models found in the sacred history, which show that the same discourse is not to be preached in every place and to every assembly, even when it is necessary to proclaim the same gospel. Paul's addresses to the Athenians, Lycaonians, Antiochans, to Felix, the Jailor, and king Agrippa, are full of instruction on this topic.

Augustine has written a treatise on preaching, which Luther proposed to himself as a model; but it is said that Augustine fell as far short of his own precepts as did any of his contemporaries. We all can with more facility give precepts to others, than conform to them ourselves. In Augustine's treatise, which in some respects influenced and formed the style and plan of Luther, and through him all the Protestants, there is much said on the best rhetorical mode "of exhibing the truth to others; but it savors more of the art of the schoolmen, than of the wisdom of the Apostles. He labors more on the best style and mode of expressing oneself, than on the things to be said.

Our best precepts in this matter are derived rather from the books of Deuteronomy and Nehemiah, than from any other source out of

the New Testament. The book of Deuteronomy may be regarded as a series of sermons or discourses, delivered to the Jews by their great teacher, Moses, rather than as a part of the Jewish history. Two things in this book deserve great attention. The first is the simplicity, fulness, and particularity of his narratives of the incidents on the journey through the wilderness;—God's doings and theirs, for the last forty years, are faithfully and intelligibly laid before them. The next is the use made of these facts; the conclusions deduced, the arguments drawn, and the exhortations tendered from these facts. For a fair and beautiful specimen of this, let the curious reader take up and carefully read the first four chapters of the book of Deuteronomy. The fact and the application, the argument and the exhortation, after the manner of Moses, cannot fail to instruct him.

The writings of the scribes during the captivity, teach us how to address a people that have lost the true meaning of the oracles of God. The readings, expositions, exhortations and prayers of Ezra and Nehemiah, are full of instruction to Christians in these days of our Babylonish captivity. To address a people long accustomed to hearing the Scriptures, yet ignorant of them, and consequently disobedient, is a matter that requires all the wisdom and prudence which can be acquired from Jewish and Christian records.

The manner of address, next to the matter of it, is most important. The weightiest arguments, the most solemn appeals, the most pathetic expostulations, if not sustained by the gravity, sincerity, and piety of the speaker, will be like water spilled upon the ground. A little levity, a few witticisms, a sarcastic air, a conceited attitude, or a harsh expression, will often neutralize all the excellencies of the most scriptural and edifying discourse. The great work of regenerating men is too solemn, too awfully grave and divine, to allow any thing of the sort. Humility, sincerity, devotion, and all benevolence in aspect, as well as in language, are essential to a successful proclamation of the great facts of the Living Oracles. He that can smile in his discourse at the follies, need not weep over the misfortunes of the ignorant and superstitious. He that can, while preaching the gospel, deride and ridicule the errors of his fellow-professors, is, for the time being, disqualified to persuade them to accept of truth, or gladly to receive the message of salvation.

Those preachers have been sadly mistaken who have sought popularity by their eccentricities, and courted smiles rather than souls;—who, by their anecdotes and foolish jests, told with the Bible before them, have thought to make themselves useful by making themselves ridiculous—and to regenerate men by teaching them how to violate the precepts of the gospel, and to disdain the examples of the Great Teacher and his Apostles.

It will not do. These are the weapons of this world, and no part of the armor of light. Jesus and his Apostles never sanctioned, by precept or example, such a course; and it is condemned by all sensible men, whether Jews or Gentiles, professors or profane.

In attempting to regenerate men, we must place before them the new man, not the old man, in the preacher as well as in the discourse; and while we seek out arguments to convince and allure them, we must show them in our speech and behaviour that we believe what we preach. So did all the Apostles and Evangelists. They commended themselves to every man's conscience, in the sight of Jesus Christ.

Error must be attacked. It must be opposed by the truth. But it may be asked, whether the darkness may not be more easily dissipated by the introduction of light, than by elaborate discourses upon its nature and attributes? So with moral darkness, or error. To dissipate it most effectually, the easiest and readiest way is to introduce the light of truth. No preacher is obliged to learn all the errors of all ages, that he may be able to oppose them; nor is a congregation enlightened in the knowledge of God by such expositions of error. Present opposing errors may require attention; but, to attack these most successfully it is only necessary to enforce the opposing truths.

This is a very grave subject, and requires very grave attention. Much depends upon a rational and scriptural decision of the question, *Which is the most effectual way to oppose and destroy error?* To aid us in such an inquiry, it is necessary to examine how the Prophets and Apostles opposed the errors of their times. The world was as full of error in those days as it has ever been since. The idolatries of the Pagan world, and the various doctrines of the sects of philosophers, in, and out, of the land of Israel, threw as much labor into their hands as the various heresies of apostate christendom have thrown into ours. Their general rule was to turn the artillery of light, and to gather into a focus the arrows of day, upon the dark shades of any particular error. Their philosophy was;—The splendors of light most clearly display the blackness of darkness, and scatter it from its presence. Thus they opposed idolatry, superstition, and error of every name. Going forth in the armor of light, as the sun in the morning, the shades of the night retired from their presence, and the cheering beams of day so gladdened the eyes of their converts that they loved darkness no more. Let us go and do likewise.

An intimate acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures is the best furniture for the work of regenerating men. The best piece I have found in the celebrated treatise of Augustine on preaching is the following:—

"He, then, who handles and teaches the word of God, should be a defender of the true faith, and a vanquisher of error; should both teach what is good, and unteach what is bad; and in accomplishing this, the object of preaching, he should conciliate the adverse, excite the remiss, and pour out to the ignorant their duty and future prospects. When, however, he finds his audience favorably disposed, attentive, and docile, or succeeds in rendering them so, then other things are to be done, as the case may require. If they are to be instructed, then, to make them acquainted with the subject in question, narration must be employed; and to establish what is doubtful, resort must be had to reasoning and evidence. If they are to be moved rather than instructed, then, to arouse them from stupor in putting their knowledge into practice, and bring them to yield full assent to those things which they confess to be true, there will be need of the higher powers of eloquence; it will be necessary to entreat, reprove, excite, restrain, and do whatsoever else may prove effectual in moving the heart.

All this, indeed, is what most men constantly do, with respect to those things which they undertake to accomplish by speaking. Some, however, in their way of doing it, are blunt, frigid, inelegant; others, ingenious, ornate, vehement. Now he who engages in the business of which I am treating, must be able to speak and dispute with wisdom, even if he cannot do so with eloquence, in order that he may profit his audience; although he will profit them less in this case, than if he could combine wisdom and eloquence together. He who abounds in eloquence without wisdom, is certainly so much the more to be avoided, from the very fact that the hearer is delighted with what it is useless to hear, and thinks what is said, to be true, because it is spoken with elegance. Nor did this sentiment escape the notice of those among the ancients, who yet regarded it as important to teach the art of rhetoric; they confessed, that wisdom without eloquence profited states but very little, but that eloquence without wisdom profited them not at all, and generally proved highly injurious. If, therefore, those who taught the precepts of eloquence, even though ignorant of the true, that is, the celestial wisdom 'which cometh down from the Father of lights,' were compelled by the instigations of truth to make such a confession, and that too in the very books in which their principles were developed; are we not under far higher obligations to acknowledge the same thing, who are the sons and daughters of this heavenly wisdom? Now a man speaks with greater or less wisdom, according to the proficiency he has made in the sacred Scriptures. I do not mean in reading them and committing them to memory, but in rightly understanding them, and diligently searching into their meaning. There are those who read them and yet neglect them—who read them to remember the words, but neglect to understand them. To these, without any doubt, those persons are to be preferred, who, retaining less the words of the Scriptures, search after their genuine signification with the inmost feelings of the heart. But better than both is he, who can repeat them when he pleases, and at the same time understands them as they ought to be understood."—[*From the Biblical Repository, p. 574. Translated from the Latin by O. A. Taylor, of Andover, Mass.*]

Luther's favorite maxim was, "*Bonus Textuarius, Bonus Theologus;*" or, one well acquainted with the Scriptures makes a good theologian.

There is one thing, above all others, which must never be lost sight of by him who devotes himself to the work of regeneration. This all-important consideration is, that the end and object of all his labors is *to impress the moral image of God upon the moral nature of man.* To draw this image upon the heart, to transform the mind of man into the likeness of God in all moral feeling, is the end proposed in the remedial system. The mould into which the mind of man is to be cast is the Apostles' doctrine; or the seal by which this impression is to be made is the testimony of God. The gospel facts are like so many types, which, when scientifically arranged by an accomplished compositor, make a complete form, upon which, when the mind of man is placed by the power which God has given to the preacher, every type makes its full impression upon the heart. There is written upon the understanding, and engraved upon the heart, the will, or law, or character of our Father who is in heaven.

The Apostles were these accomplished compositors, who gave us a *perfect "form of sound words."* Our instrumentality consists in bringing the minds of men to this form, or impressing it upon their hearts. To do this most effectually, the preacher or evangelist must have the word of Christ dwelling in him richly, in all wisdom; and

he must "study to show himself an approved workman, irreproachable, rightly dividing the word of truth." He that is most eloquent and wise in the Holy Scriptures, he who has them most at command, will have the most power with men; because being furnished with the words of the Holy Spirit, he has the very arguments which the Spirit of God chooses to employ in quickening the dead, in converting sinners. For to the efficiency of the living word not only Paul deposes, but James and Peter also bear ample testimony. "Of his own will he has begot us, *by the word of truth*, that we might be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." James i. 18.—"Having been regenerated, not by corruptible seed, but by incorruptible, *through the word* of the living God, which remains." 1 Peter i. 23. To the fruits of his labors, such a preacher with Paul may say, "To Jesus Christ, through the gospel, I have regenerated, or begotten you."

Thus, in the midst of numerous interruptions, we have attempted to lay before the minds of our readers the whole doctrine of Regeneration, in all its length and breadth, in the hope that after a more particular attention to its meaning and value, by the blessing of God, they may devote themselves more successfully to this great work; and not only enjoy more of the Holy Spirit themselves, but be more useful in forwarding the moral regeneration of the world.

To God our Father, through the great Author of the Christian faith, who has preserved us in health in this day of affliction and great distress, be everlasting thanks for the renewing of our minds by the Holy Spirit, and for the hope of the regeneration of our bodies, of the heavens and of the earth, at the appearance of the Almighty Regenerator, who comes to make all things new! Amen.

EDITOR.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VIII.——Volume IV.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. August, 1833.

Signs of the Times.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING CONSIDERED, WITH THE RELATIVE EVENTS.

"Behold the Bridegroom comes: go you out to meet him."

By S. M. M'Corkle,—*a Layman.*

(*Continued.*)

MARRIAGE OF THE KING'S SON—Matt. xxii.

UPON a close examination of this parable, it will be found plainly relative to the Jewish and Gentile Dispensations.

This parable is often descanted on by our teachers. They tell us much about the customs of past ages; much trash about olden times—a thousand years twice told, and gone; without ever dropping a single word about the true meaning of the parable. Some of them have been so grossly ignorant as to fix this marriage in the worlds above. A guest without a wedding garment, without holiness in heaven, would really be an oversight! They tell us many fine things about a fitness, about a wedding garment, &c. but none, no, not one telling us when it is to be. This is one of their non-essentials! Most of the commands of the Master, and many of his precepts too, have, by his professed ambassadors, been turned into *non-essentials!* Is there not some danger by thus doing, of forfeiting a seat at the marriage supper of the Lamb?

In all marriages place and parties are presupposed. In this marriage there are guests spoken of, and a King "who made a marriage

for his Son;" besides this, there are servants sent forth "to call them that were bidden to the wedding." We may not trifle with this parable. Who can go to a wedding without knowing when it is to be? Are the servants doing this? They are calling guests to a marriage, and leaving them to guess the where and the when, &c. It is all-important that the place where this marriage is to be consummated should be known. To say, 'In heaven,' is too absurd for common sense to admit. To say, 'In the human heart,' is not less so.

If those guests be passions, virtues, or vices in the human heart, the servants have called the whole of them in from the highways: "And they gathered together as many as they found, both bad and good." On this ground the difficulty is not obviated.

It is hardly possible that this parable can have an accomplishment any where else than on earth; and that these guests can be any thing else than men; aye, really and positively human beings, not principles. Facts are better than arguments; and it is a notorious fact that the Jewish church rejected an invitation to the marriage, slew, and shamefully handled the servants; and the King "sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city."

The servants were ordered into the highways; the Gentiles are called, are entrusted with a dispensation: guests are to be furnished out of the Gentile world for this marriage: they are to be guests, not the bride: "The bride, the Lamb's wife, will descend out of heaven from God." "And he saith unto me, Write, blessed are they who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb!"

Now, reader, can men be understanding or obeying the precept of the Master, who are so widely mistaking and misapplying the meaning of his parables and predictions? Remember the fate of those who are led by blind guides.

The parable of the ten virgins is near akin to this respecting the marriage of the King's Son; cannot have a different meaning; cannot be applied to the final judgment, without inconsistencies too barefaced to be palmed on common sense. The first item in this parable corresponds with that of the tares mingled, and growing together with the wheat. That God's kingdom, or moral government, at the present time on earth, will produce as many; count, equal numbers of foolish virgins with the wise. If christendom can count at this time one wise virgin out of the ten, the world is not so near a visitation from the vials of the wrath of Almighty God as we suppose; and not so near an overthrow as present appearances indicate. That this parable is not applicable to the close of time, I will advance the following reasons:—

First, that in all the predictions relative to the close of time, a trumpet introduces the great event; "great sound of a trumpet;" "last trump;" "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, with the trump of God."

In the parable under consideration there is "a cry made, Behold the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." From the very face of the parable it is plainly to be understood that the cry is to originate

among the virgins; the voice is manifestly among them—"Go ye out to meet him!" Not the most distant intimation that any herald had announced his approach.

No one can give a "thus saith the Lord" for it, that there is to be a preparatory alarm given previous to the time when "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout." The order of that day will be, "He that is filthy let him be filthy still." But there is an intermediate space of time between the *cry*, "Behold he cometh," and the closing of the door—an admonition, "Go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves." Will this admonition be given in the eventful hour when the mighty human drama will be wound up, when the voice of Omnipotence will remand from the abodes of death the myriads of human beings who for ages past have been unknown from the trodden soil. Who, with the Bible in his hand, can believe that after the Judge of all the earth has irrevocably fixed the destiny of the human family, shut to the door, that a mistaken half will knock at heaven's gate, and demand admission? Will not the guilty in another state of existence avoid, as far as possible, the presence of the God whose laws they have violated?

There is another difficulty which I cannot see a possibility of solving. The number of foolish virgins will rivet the fulfilment upon the present dispensation; for it will not apply to millennial perfection, when there is to be nothing to hurt or offend, and all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest. There is no room for foolish virgins in the universal reign of Christ. Who can be so zeal-smitten as to expect millennial perfection to rise out of the present dispensation; or that a period when the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our God and his Christ, will afford as much evil as good, or an equal number of ungodly professors as righteous ones? "While the bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept." How profound the sleep into which the world is sunk! The world is to be found asleep, unprepared, let the events come when they will. There may be a few midnight sentinels, who will be found watching, with their loins girt, with their shoes on their feet, waiting the return of the Master. "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing." But, and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants," &c. to eat and drink with the drunken. There is no item in prophecy more applicable to the present situation of the world than this. How few are not smiting—are not smitten, *with the tongue!* If this is not a portrait of the church, or rather the churches, there is no correct conclusion to be drawn from the conduct of men—no such thing as truth, error, or falsehood.

"While the bridegroom tarried." Can he be said to tarry without a previous appointment? "And while they went to buy the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him into the marriage: and the door was shut." Now who can prepare for an event unexpected, unlooked for? How few believe that this marriage is to take place on earth! How few thinking about washing their

robes and making them white, having their hands clean? Do the priests believe these things? Think ye that they can be ready when they are almost universally sceptical on this subject? Will they not be seized with astonishment, taken at surprize, with their lamps gone out—cavilling and questioning the authority, the truth of the Master's return—lulling themselves and their people into sleep—disregarding the monitions of those who may be awake to *the signs of the times*—clinging to their traditions until they are roused from their dreams and fatal repose by a voice which cannot be mistaken or disregarded. And among the fatal mistakes made by the foolish virgins, will be that of applying for aid to those who have not the power of affording relief: "Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves." Are the foolish virgins at the close of time to apply for admission into the paradise of God, saying, "Lord, Lord, open unto us. But he answered, and said, Verily, I say unto you, I know you not."

Here I will make a short digression, and draw a supposition: Suppose the sectarians of the day were called up and interrogated, Who are you? One would answer, A Presbyterian; another, A Methodist, &c. would it be unreasonable if they were repulsed with "I know you not." Would not their very identification stand in judgment against them? Who dare sanctify that ever persecuted name of Master into endurance by a P, an M, or a B. If I dare venture to do this, I would be seriously afraid at the marriage supper he would say unto me, "I know you not."

Now does this parable, taken together in all its parts, look as if it was to be transacted at the close of time? A part are ordered to go and buy oil for their lamps; they went, they returned, they applied for admission; were once identified with the wise, will begin when it is too late to prepare for the marriage supper.

The parable of the talents immediately follows that of the virgins, and has, no doubt, a corresponding meaning. The same kingdom is the one which is found in the other. If we can find the proper object for the phrase "kingdom of heaven" in one parable, we have it for the whole.

"For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants and delivered to them his goods. And unto one he gave five talents; to another, two; and to another, one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey."

The first part of this parable has been exactly fulfilled; for Christ, after giving his Apostles those precepts and laws relative to his reign in the Christian dispensation, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, &c. and when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. Here the Master "straightway took his journey." "After a long time the Lord of those servants cometh and reckoneth with them." About eighteen hundred

years since this personage took his journey this may be called "a long time;" and probably in less than one year for every hundred, will this very personage return in "like manner" on a cloud, and call the servants to a reckoning. Then will the last part of the parable have its accomplishment in every jot and tittle. "And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents," &c. "His Lord saith unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant! thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things," &c. If this parable is to have its accomplishment at the close of time, over whom are those servants to rule? Are they to rule in the heaven above? A ruler of necessity must have subjects; a subject must be either ignorant or vicious before there can be a necessity for a ruler. There can be no necessity for rulers in a government where there is neither ignorance nor vice. A ruler presupposes a rule, a subject, a possibility of erring. And this cannot apply to the perfection which is expected in another state of existence. This parable of course must relate to this world, where men need rules and rulers too. The only rule which we need is the word of God. Strict conformity to its precepts would supersede all laws or legislation; and where other laws are necessary it is an evidence of bad subjects. Laws or rules are for the lawless and disobedient.

But farther on this subject, see Luke xix. 17. "Because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities." Are there ten cities in the heaven above? The same journey, the same return, the servant called to account, and authority given to the faithful. See Luke xxii. 28. "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Now at the close of time the kingdom is to be given into the hands of the Father; so says Paul. And who will suppose for a moment that there will be a distinction of tribes in the world above? Compare this with Rev. xx. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them; and judgment was given unto them." The same thrones and the same authority; and according to Christ's own words, they are to have authority in his kingdom. This must be in the future; for the Apostles have never sat on thrones, judging the twelve tribes.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Sherlock on Divine Providence.

[CONTINUED.]

HAVING thus briefly shown what government God has both of the heart and the actions of men, how easily he can alter their counsels and manage their passions, make them do what good they never intended, and disappoint the evil which they did intend, or turn it into

good. This is a sufficient demonstration, how absolute the divine providence is. For he who has such an absolute government of nature, of what we call chance and fortune, and of the wills and actions of men, can do whatsoever pleaseth him. But that we may have the clearer and more distinct apprehension of God's government of mankind to make them the instruments of his providence, I shall more particularly, but very briefly, state this matter, both with respect to good and to bad men.

1. As for good men, there is no difficulty in their case; for they are the ministers of a good and beneficent providence. They do good out of temper and inclination, and a habit and principle of virtue, and out of reverence to the divine laws, and are ready to obey every extraordinary impression to excite and determine them to such particular good offices as God thinks fit to employ them in. And this is nothing but what is very honorable for God, and what becomes good men; for to do good is the glory of human nature, as well as of the divine providence. And good men will observe the laws of virtue in doing good; and while good is done by honest and virtuous means, there can be no objection against providence.

2. But as bad men are most difficultly governed, so the greatest difficulty is in vindicating providence in making use of the ministries of bad men. For it is commonly thought a great blemish to providence when glorious and admirable designs are brought to pass by the sins of men. Now the foundation of this objection is a great mistake, as if God could not serve his own providence by the sins of men without being the cause of men's sins. For there is no color nor reasonable pretence of an objection against God's making the sins of men serve wise and good ends, if he can do this without having any hand in men's sins.

It is the great glory of Providence to bring good out of evil, and while all the events of providence are just, and righteous, and holy, and wise, and such as become a God, it is much more admirable to consider that all this should be, while there is so much wickedness and disorder in the world.

The true state of this matter in short is this:—God never suggests any evil designs to men. That is owing to their own wicked hearts, or to the temptations of other wicked men, or of wicked spirits. But when men have formed any wicked designs, he sometimes, as you have heard, changes their purposes, or deters them from putting them in execution. And when he suffers them to proceed to action, he either shamefully disappoints them, or serves some wise and good end by what they wickedly do. And if providence consists in the care and government of mankind, how can God govern mankind better than to permit bad men not to do more hurt than he can turn to good? God does not govern the world by an immediate and miraculous power, but governs men by men, and makes them help and defend, reward and punish one another. And therefore there is no other ordinary way of punishing bad men (excepting the civil sword which reaches but a few criminals) but to punish them by the wickedness of other bad

men. And what can more become the wisdom and justice of Providence than to make bad men the ministers and executioners of a divine vengeance upon each other, which is one great end God serves by the sins of men. I am sure that it is for the great good of the world that God has the government of bad men that they cannot do so much hurt as they would, and the mischief God permits them to do is directed to fall on such persons as either want correction, or deserve punishment. For this is another thing very observable in God's government both of the good and bad actions of men—that as in the government of natural causes God directs where, and when, and in what proportion nature shall exert its influences. That it shall rain upon one city, and not upon another. So God does not only excite men to do good, but directs and determines them where to do it—chooses out such persons as they shall do good to, and appoints what good they shall do, and in what measure and proportions they shall do it. And he not only sets bounds to the lusts and passions of bad men, but when he sees fit to permit their wickedness, he directs where the hurt and mischief of it shall light. We need no other proof of this but the very notion of providence, which is, God's care of his creatures. For that requires a particular application of the good or evil which men do to such particular persons as God thinks fit to do good to, or to afflict and punish, which is the most material and most necessary exercise of the wisdom, and justice, and goodness of Providence. For if God suffered men to do good or evil at random, without directing them to fit and proper objects, the fortunes of particular men would depend upon as great a chance as the mutable lusts, and passions, and fancies of men.

The only use I shall make of this at present is to convince you how perfectly we are in God's hands, and how secure we are in his protection—what little reason we have to be afraid of men, whatever their power, how furious soever their passions are—how vain it is to trust in men and to depend on their favor, for they can neither do good nor hurt but as they are directed by God, and therefore he alone must be the supreme object of our fear and trust. "If God be for us who can be against us?" If we make him our enemy who can save us out of his hands? So that we have but one thing to take care of, and we are safe: let us make God our friend, and he will raise us up friends, and patrons, and protectors—will deliver us out of the hands of our enemies, or make our enemies to be at peace with us.

Secondly. Having thus explained God's government of causes, let us now consider his government of events. And I think it will be easily granted me that if all those causes by which all events are brought to pass are governed by God, God must also have the absolute government of all events in his own hands.

But the government of causes and events are of a very different consideration, and to represent this as plainly and familiarly as I can, I shall show you, 1st. what I mean by events when I attribute the government of all events to God. 2d. Wherein God's government of events consists. 3d. The difference between God's absolute govern-

ment of all events, and necessity and fate. 4th. That the exercise of a particular providence consists in the government of all events.

1. What I mean by events. Now every thing that is done may in a large sense be called an event, and is in some degree or other under the government of Providence, as all the actions of men are. But when I speak of God's government of events, I mean only such events as are in Scripture called God's *doings*, as being ordered and appointed by him; that is to say, all the good or evil which happens to private men, or to kingdoms and nations in this world. Every thing that is done is not God's doing, for there is a great deal of evil every day committed which God does not order and appoint to be done, but has expressly forbid the doing of it. But there is no good or evil which happens to any man, or to any society of men, but what God orders and appoints for them: and this is God's government of all events. This is the proper exercise of Providence, to allot all men their fortunes and conditions in the world, to dispense rewards and punishments, to take care that no man shall receive either good or evil but from the hand and by the appointment of God. This is the subject of all the disputes about the justice, and goodness, and wisdom of Providence; and all the objections against Providence necessarily suppose that thus it is, or thus it ought to be if God govern the world. For unless Providence be concerned to take care that no men be happy or miserable but as they deserve, which cannot be without the absolute government of all events, the prosperity of bad men and the sufferings of the good, the many miseries that are in the world, and the uncertain changes and turnings of fortune, can be no objection against Providence. And, indeed, were not this the case, Providence would be so insignificant a name, that it would not be worth the while to dispute for or against it. For a Providence which neither can do us good nor hurt, or which cannot always and in all cases do it, is worth nothing, or worth no more than it can do good or hurt. And therefore all the good or evil which does or can befall men or kingdoms, is in Scripture attributed to Providence, and promised or threatened by God as men shall deserve either. Such as length of days, or a sudden and untimely death, health or sickness, honor or disgrace, riches or poverty, plenty or famine, war or peace, the changing times and seasons, the removing kings and setting up kings; and with respect to such events as these, whatever the immediate causes of them be, God is said to do whatsoever pleaseth him.

2*dly*. But we shall better understand this by inquiring into the nature of God's government. Now God's government of events consists in ordering and appointing whatever good or evil shall befall men. For according to the Scripture we must attribute such a government to God as makes all these events *his will and doing;* and nothing can be his will and doing but what he wills and orders.

Some men think it enough to say that God permits every thing that is done, but will by no means allow that God wills, and orders and appoints it, which they are afraid will charge the divine Providence with all the evil that is done in the world; and truly so it would did

God order and appoint the evil to be done. But though God orders and appoints what evils every man shall suffer, he orders and appoints no man to do the evil; he only permits some men to do mischief, and appoints who shall suffer by it, which is the short resolution of this case. To attribute the evils which some men suffer from other men's sins, merely to God's permission, is to destroy the government of Providence—for bare permission is not government; and those evils which God permits, but does not order, cannot be called *his will and doing*. And if this be the case of all the evils we suffer from other men's sins, most of the evils which men suffer befall them without God's will and appointment. And yet to attribute all the evil which men do to God's order and appointment, is to destroy the holiness of Providence. And therefore we must necessarily distinguish between the evils men do and the evils they suffer. The first God permits and directs; the second he orders and appoints. How God governs men's hearts and actions I have already explained, and this is the place to consider God's permission of evil, for permission relates to actions. Men's own wicked hearts conceive and form wicked designs, and they execute them by God's permission; but no man suffers by them but by God's appointment. God's care of his creatures requires that no man should suffer any thing but what God orders for him; and if such sufferings be just and righteous, how wicked soever the causes be, it is no reproach to Providence to order and appoint them. Suppose a man have forfeited his life or estate, or reputation to Providence, or though he have made no criminal forfeiture of it, yet God sees fit for other wise reasons to remove him out of the world, or to reduce him to poverty and contempt. Is it any fault in Providence to deliver such a man into the hands of murderers, oppressors, slanderers, who are very forward to execute such decrees when Providence takes off the restraint and sets them at liberty to follow their own lusts? And when there are so many that deserve or need these or such kind of punishments or corrections, and such vast numbers of bad men who are ready every day to commit such outrages did not God restrain them, is it not very visible how easily God can order and appoint such sufferings for men without ordering or appointing any man's sins? It requires no more than to bring those whom God appoints for suffering into the reach of such men, and to put them into their power, and their own malice and wickedness will do the rest. It is like exposing condemned malefactors to wild beasts whose nature and inclination is to devour; and if God chains up bad men as we do wild beasts, that they cannot touch any one but whom God delivers up to them, and lets them loose only to execute his own just and righteous judgment, can any thing be more honorable to Providence, or a greater security to mankind?

To form an idea of this in our minds, let us suppose this to be the case of an earthly prince, that he perfectly understood all the deserts and all the inclinations of his subjects, and had such an invisible and insensible authority over them, that, without giving them any directions, or letting them know any thing of his intentions, or offering any

violence to their own inclinations, he could determine them to do that hurt which they had a mind to do to those, and to those only, whom he intended to punish; and to do the good they are desirous to do, to those, and to those only, whom he intends to reward: in case such a prince took care that no man should suffer more from the wickedness of others, than what he deserved, and the reasons of government required, would any man charge such a prince with all the wickedness that is committed in his kingdom, only because he so wisely orders it, that some bad men shall execute his vengeance upon other bad men, and serve instead of judge, and jury, and executioners? Nay, would not every man say, that this is the most perfect and absolute form of government in the world? Earthly princes, indeed, cannot do this; but this is the government of God, who accomplishes his own wise counsels by the ministries of men.

And this may satisfy us in what sense all the good and all the evil that happens either to private men or to kingdoms and nations, is said to be *God's will*, and *God's doing, and what pleaseth him;* because no man or nation is rewarded or punished but by God's order and appointment; that as many good men as there are in the world, who are ready to do good to all they can, and as many bad men as there are who are ready to do all the mischief they can, none of them can do either good or hurt to any but to those whom God has appointed for either, which makes God the absolute Lord and Sovereign of the world, since whatever men intend, all men's fortunes and conditions depend upon his will.

And since God absolutely orders and appoints nothing but the event, if the event be holy, just, and good—that is, if men be rewarded and punished according to their works, as far as the justice and goodness of Providence is concerned in this world, there can be no reasonable objection against Providence; for by what wicked means soever men be rewarded or punished, if the reward or punishment be holy, just, and good, this vindicates the holiness, and justice, and goodness of Providence: of which more hereafter. Let men's wickedness be to themselves, for that is their own; but that the wickedness of men is over-ruled by an invisible hand to accomplish wise and just decrees, that is the glory of Providence.

And this suggests another evident reason why all the good or evil that befalls men, is called *God's will* and *God's doings*, because, in a strict and proper sense, it is not man's will nor man's doings. What is done is either what those who did it never intended to do, or else serves such ends, and is ordered by God for such ends, as those who did it never thought of; which proves men to be only instruments, but God the Supreme Disposer of all events. If we must attribute all things that are done either to God or men, then what is not done by men must be done by God; and men cannot be properly said to do what they never intended; and therefore whatever is either beyond or contrary to what men intended, must either be attributed to chance or to a divine Providence. I observed before what different intentions God and men have in the same actions—what is intended by

men, is their doing—what is intended by God, is his doing, and wholly his doing, when what God intended was not intended by men. For this reason Joseph tells his brethren that it was not they, but God that sent him into Egypt, (Gen. xl. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.) for they thought nothing of sending him into Egypt; but this was what God intended when he permitted them to sell him to the Ishmaelites. This was their sin, as he adds, Gen. l. 20. "But as for you, ye thought evil against me;" but the good that was done was wholly God's doings; "but God meant it unto good." And thus it is in other cases, which shows us what the Scripture calls God's doings. The punishment of sinners, and those evils he brings on them, are God's doings, but not the sins whereby they are punished. The punishment of David's adultery by the incest of Absalom, was God's doing, but not Absalom's incest. The sending Joseph into Egypt, and advancing him into Pharoah's throne, were God's doings; but not the sin of his brethren in selling him for a slave. And thus it is throughout the Scripture: nothing is called God's will or God's doing which has any moral evil in it: all wicked actions are men's own will and own doings, which God permits for wise ends, but never orders or appoints; but the good or evil which is done by men's sins, that is God's doing. And I hope by this time you all know how to distinguish between God's government of men's actions, and his government of events; and then we may safely attribute all events to God's order and appointment, without danger of charging God with the sins of men, whereby such events are brought to pass.

[*To be continued.*]

Letter from Henry Grew---Part 2.

I UNDERSTAND my respected brother to imagine, that if the Word or Son of God is not the eternal independent God himself, the Father "gives him nothing to do, which the son of Joseph could not have done as well." You ask, "What creature could do more than Abel, Moses, &c. did—tell the truth, the whole truth, lead an exemplary life, and as a martyr offer up his soul to God?" Astonishing! Are there no *degrees* of ability and perfection among creatures? But let us review your argument. You remark, "If Jesus never was, as to his celestial origin, more than a creature, he could, as a sin offering, effect nothing more than any other creature: his life and death were all due to his Creator on his own account." Ah! brother, was it so? Admitting him to be really the "first begotten," the first born of every creature," the image of the invisible God, the brightness of his glory, perfectly holy, ever delighting to do his Father's will, never, in the least particular, transgressing—was his amazing humiliation, his suffering life, his agonizing death, "all due to his Creator *on his own account*"? Have you not affirmed prematurely? Do you know of any law or principle of government appertaining to the Righteous Governor of the Universe, which requires a

subject of that government who perpetually loves and obeys with all his powers, to suffer and die *on his own account?* I understand the Law, by which the Holy One maintains his immutable Throne, to be, Do, and live; Disobey, and die. I affirm, therefore, that the Holy Son of God was not obliged to die *on his own account*; and, consequently, considering the dignity and perfection of *the real sufferer*, the true Son of God, made before and "better than the angels," his voluntary humiliation and perfect obedience unto death, is perfectly adequate to the design of infinite wisdom to declare the righteousness of God in justifying him who believes in Jesus. (20.)

And now, for the truth's sake, beloved, I do most earnestly beseech you to consider whether your own views do not necessarily involve the difficulty you aim to avoid. Unless you suppose that the immutable God really changed—emptied himself, suffered and died; all the humiliation, suffering, and death of your Saviour appertain *solely to the humanity.* It was a *human* sacrifice. It was not the *real* humiliation, and suffering, and death of the Son of God, if by this term is understood any thing more than holy humanity. Let your intelligent mind contemplate Phil. ii. 5—11. and try if you can possibly reconcile the affecting truth there exhibited of the real humiliation of the Son of God in not eagerly retaining that likeness he had to God, [see the original,] but humbling or emptying himself, with your present views. Does not the Apostle clearly teach that there was in fact *a real change* in respect to *the highest glory* of the Son, which is totally incompatible with supreme and *immutable* Deity? Did Jehovah become obedient and die? If so, whom did he obey, and who raised him from the dead? "Who hath given to him," as a reward of his humiliation and obedience? Who is that other being to whose glory we are commanded to worship him? Phil. ii. 11.

No. 20.—"*Die on his own account.*" You certainly will admit that every creature owes his whole being and perfections, whatever they may be, to him that created him. To him he owes life, and that love of life characteristic of animated nature. He owes himself, and therefore we cannot imagine any created being *just*, who would refuse to lay down, or give back that life which he received when he that gave it requires it. This is the very essence of all obedience: for unless life is given up in every act of obedience, there is nothing of the nature of obedience in the act. So our Lord taught me to reason: "For he that hates not his own life" (loves it less than my will) "cannot be my disciple." Indeed, an obedience proceeding upon any other principle would demand as a *bonus* the guaranty of life, or the assurance of life before it would act at all. A creature that owes not its death to the will of God, owes not its life. The giving up of life, as much as any other use of life, is due from every creature to him who gave him life. If any man will agree to rest the merits of any great question on the proof of the following proposition, I will undertake its proof: *He that does not hold his life as due to his Creator, never can obey him in any act of his life.* I, therefore, fearlessly repeat my affirmation, That if my Redeemer was never more than a creature, he never could do more than pay his own debts; or, in other words, he never could do more than love and obey God for himself; and if God required his death for any purpose it was but *just* for him to obey in that act as in any act of his life. On your hypothesis no man owes but a few cents more to Jesus Christ than to any of the ancient martyrs.

If your view is correct, has our Father given any thing more to *really* suffer and die for us than a perfect man? How can this accord with the affecting representations in the testimony of his great love in giving *his own Son* TO DIE for us? (21.)

By what process of reasoning does my dear brother come to the conclusion that the matchless Son of God can do no more than Abel, &c. except he be that *very God* whose *Son* he is declared to be? Could not he who was "*made* so much better than the angels," (Heb. i. 4) speak as never man spake? How do you *prove* that "the first born of every creature," who is the image of the invisible God, can do no more than a fallible, imperfect man? Do we not contradict the testimony, if we say that he is incompetent, unless he is independent and omnipotent, when he himself assures us, that *all the power* by which he gives eternal life to his followers, is given him by the Father? John xvii. 2. Shall we affirm this, when the inspired Apostle so plainly teaches us that God our Father and Saviour saves us "through Jesus Christ our Saviour"? Titus iii. 4, 5.

To my first query you reply, Jehovah is the one only living and true God. But who is Jehovah? Is our Father Jehovah? No, I affirm that he is not, *if two other persons or beings equal to himself are necessary to constitute Jehovah.* In this case, (I write with reverence,) our Father is only *a part* of Jehovah. If I say of a mercantile firm of three persons, that the firm is A, B and C, and then say that the firm is A, do I not contradict myself? Must I not say only that A is one of the firm? Now I am happy in the assurance that I am interchanging views with one who will no more allow us to contradict ourselves in speaking of *divine* things, than in speaking of those which are *human*; one who will not shield himself from rational and scriptural argument under the covert of *mystery.* (22)

21.—I never separate humanity nor divinity, nor speak in this style of my Saviour. I do not thus sabmit his person to the metaphysico-theologico dissecting knife. He spoke of himself in accordance with his whole person and nature. But the separating, confounding, confusing, or speculating upon his two natures, is a species of barbarous philosophy, never indulged in by any inspired person, and therefore I cross not the threshold of that temple. Indeed, I speculate not thus upon the body, soul, and spirit of any human being. I ask not whether such an act of obedience was instinctive, purely animal, intellectual, moral—whether the hand moved in obedience to the soul or the spirit, and how much praise is due to the hand, to the soul, and to the spirit in this thing. It is all philosophic trifling.

22.—"*Covert of mystery.*"—I have no idea of shielding myself under the covert of mystery; but I have no use of shield if my brother Grew would not shower his javelins at me. There is too much *man-ism* or *my-ism* in all these speculations. But really this is a curiosity—"*covert of mystery*"! the covert of a secret! And does not brother Grew believe secrets? He believes that Jesus Christ was originally begotten and born before there was any creature. But how long before, and how this came to pass, and how much of eternity had passed before this first born was conceived, is no secret to him; for he would not believe any thing which he cannot comprehend as clear as how his mind can in a moment grasp the two extremes of a million of Jubilees! This is just the reason why we have so many volumes upon the pre-existence of the Messiah, &c. &c. eternal generation, filiation, and their contraries: because

I know that Paul in 1 Cor. viii. 6 is contradistinguishing the one God from the "gods many of Paganism;" but this no proof that he is not contradistinguishing the Father, *as the one God*, from all other persons or beings in the universe. The plain and positive testimony is, that there is *but one God*, and that this one God is *the Father*. Systems aside, must not the candid mind allow the truth here plainly revealed, to be, that the Father is the one God in distinction from all other persons or beings in existence? He is particularly distinguished, as the one God, from the very being who approximates nearest to himself in dignity and perfection;—the one Lord *by* whom are all things. The one Lord BY whom are all things, is clearly distinguished from the one God OF whom are all things. I reflected on the imaginary difficulty you suggest, ten years ago. After "a little more reflection," I still affirm, as I did then, that the Father *is excluded* in the declaration of "the one Lord *by* whom are all things." The Father is not the *medium*, or *agent*, BY whom are all things, but the eternal and independent *source*, OF whom are all things. There is no confusion here. The ideas suggested by the testimony on this important truth, are clear, distinct, harmonious. *In another sense*, the Father indeed is Lord. He is, as you say, "the one *absolute* Lord." But, brother, if so, must he not be "*greater than all*"? (23)

One thought more, if you please, on this testimony that the Father is the one God. Is there a single declaration in either Testament

---

great men and gigantic reasoners, philosophers, sceptics, &c. will not take refuge under the "covert of mystery." They will believe no secrets; while my faith begins, like myself, in a great mystery. For *I believe there is one infinite, eternal, unoriginated, all-comprehending, and incomprehensible Jehovah!* I take covert and find a sanctuary under the shadow of this great mystery. God forbid that I should say to my faith, According to my reason and comprehension, so be it to thee; hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther, and here let thy belief in God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, cease.

I admit nothing contrary to reason; but I do admit there are at least two or three matters in this great creation which I cannot comprehend; and some times both my reason and my faith lay their heads together under "the covert of mystery." Even the Newtonian and Baconian systems of philosophy require us to begin with a secret, and tell us we need not push our inquiries at all unless we admit some postulates and take something for granted. Whence came the law of attraction—and its antagonist principle, repulsion? Why form they so many circles, globes, and spheres in this creation? From what eternal fire is the sun supplied, and how scatters he his influences forever without decay? Has the rain a father, and who has begotten the dew? But I stop. Mathematics has its definitions and its postulates. There is not a science without its incomprehensibles. Therefore I can believe that God exists, and that he ever had his Word and his Spirit.

But were I, my dear sir, to put a few questions to you on the comprehensibility of your views of God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, do you think you could stand upon your principles? Methinks I see your causeway to the skies taken up stone by stone, until, like the earth, you hang upon nothing midway between two opposing powers. A God that we can comprehend is an idol—a thing unworthy of adoration!

23.—The sense of Scripture is not manifold, but one. You have conceded to me the true meaning of 1 Cor. viii. 6. and therefore it cannot mean any thing else.

respecting the one God, that has the shadow of a contradiction to it? Is there any declaration that the one God is *any other than the Father?* that the one God is *three?* or that he is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? or that these three *are one God?* Most surely there is not. Is it not, then, a violation of the just rule of interpretation, to oppose and set aside the obvious import of the plain positive testimony that the one God is the Father, by "*inferences*" from passages which are susceptible of a different construction? If 1 Cor. viii. 6 furnishes not the answer to the great question, Who is the one God? are we not without revelation on the subject? (24)

You observe, "The Scriptures no where teach me that the Son, in his highest personal nature had a beginning of being or existence." As proof to the contrary, you have quoted, "the Word was in the beginning with God." But this we have seen is no more evidence of the eternity of the Son, than of the eternity of the earth.

You further affirm, "My Lord and Saviour is no creature," &c. Ah! beloved, when shall we cease to be wise above what is written? On the authority of eternal truth, I affirm that he is a creature, though of transcendent excellency. Many will go with you here: I go with the testimony. He is "the first born *of every creature*"—"the beginning of the creation of God"—his "*first*," his "only begotten" Son. He was, indeed, *declared* to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead, but he did not then *first become* his Son. That holy thing which was born of the Virgin was *called* the Son of God, because the Son of God was then "made flesh," took *the body* prepared him, (not a human soul); but this is no proof that he then *first became* the Son of God. The Father sent his Son into the world. He was his Son before he sent him. As a Son he came down from heaven, *not to do his own will*, which assuredly it behooved him to do as much as the Father's, if he was perfectly equal. John i. 14 clearly teaches that the glory of the Word, and the glory of the only begotten Son, is one and the same glory, as Mr. Fuller justly observed. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, [i. e. the glory of the Word,] the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." (25)

24.—We worship God the Father, as the Father, as our Father who is in heaven, and on him alone all our worship terminates. But we regard Jesus as Emanuel, God with us, God manifested in our flesh, and to the glory of the Father we worship him as the Father has commanded; because he is the delight of his Father, and there is no idolatry in worshipping him in whom the Father delights as his own image—as his own *Word*—which to us is God: for "the Word is God." It is in the economy of redemption we have the subordination of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; or Jehovah, revealed in the *names* of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By this revelation we are to walk on earth. But in heaven, after the redemption is consummated, we shall have better eyes and better understandings; and when the remedial system terminates we are told that new developments of God will be made. Let us then wait that day.

25.—My remarks on the phrase "beginning of creation" are already before you. Luther was the beginning of the Reformation; Jesus is the author of creation—he too is the Alpha and Omega—he is the first born of every crea-

You remark, "'My Father is greater than I' I understand in an economical or restricted sense." Permit me to ask, Does not the connexion forbid such restriction? "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto my Father, for my Father is greater than I." What is the teaching here? Is it not that the felicity of the Son, *when he should return to the Father*, and be glorified with the glory of his celestial nature, which he had with him before the world was, would arise from the fact that the Father is greater than himself? If the glory which he had before the world was, which *he prayed* to be restored, was the glory of Supreme Deity, must not that have been an adequate source of felicity? How could his felicity be a consequence of the superiority of his Father, if no such superiority existed after his return to him?

Lastly, on the worship to be given to him who hath loved us and washed us in his own blood. On this theme, you have touched a chord in my heart which responds to you with the most thrilling emotion. I say with you, "His be the hallelujahs of the heavens—his the hosannas of the church." In your pious flight of holy and rapturous devotion, I will accompany you, or follow on humbler pinions, *to the utmost boundary of truth.* If you will soar beyond that holy region, I go not. I worship, not indeed "mathematically," but in spirit and in truth: mark it, brother, not *in spirit* only, but also *in truth.* "I would not for the universe weaken the force of a single expression, or subtract from the boldest metaphor aught of its riches designed to set forth" the *true* glory of the Son of God, or his claims to our affection and worship. I do and will worship him, not according to human systems, but according to the testimony, as the angels and the redeemed do—as the "first begotten," (see Heb. i. 6) as "the

---

ture; for he has become the first born from the dead, that in all things he might be pre-eminent.

But now that you have come out in unqualified language, and assert that *in your opinion* the Word was a creature—the Messiah, the Son of God was only a creature, though of transcendant excellency—where is this said in Scripture? This is wholly an inference. Now, after all, does it come to this—that while you talk of Scripture testimony, and object to all human inferences, and denounce the Calvinists for their "eternal generation," &c. that you affirm the Lord of glory to have been never more nor less than "a creature of transcendant excellency"? What prophet, apostle, or angel has so affirmed? Not one! "The first born of every creature" no more means a creature, than the phrase *creation of God* means God himself. No inspired man ever called him a creature, "by whom all things, and for whom all things were created and made." "*He was before all things.*" That had no beginning which was before all things. He is no part of the things which through him consist.

This is more mysterious than Trinitarianism itself. A creature made before creation! and this same creature living from some indefinite eternity, was again created of the Virgin Mary the Son of God in consequence of his first creation, and the Son of Man in consequence of his second creation. My dear sir, do reconsider this conclusion to which your reasonings have brought you; for in it methinks you will perceive how easy it is in avoiding one extreme to run into another; and while objecting to one system because of its Babylonish terms and phrases, adopting another as replete with mysteries and Babelisms as that rejected.

Lamb that was slain," (Rev. v. 12) who has redeemed us to God by his blood. I worship him with understanding, *in his true character*, as the image of the invisible God, whom the Father has begotten, sent, exalted and glorified. I worship him as the testimony requires, "to the glory of God the Father." I worship my Father, my blessed Father, as "*the only true God*," as my Saviour did, to the glory of none above him; for there is none.

Your pious and eloquent appeal to the devotional feelings, will be conclusive with many of your readers. I beg your candid considerations of the reasons I offer you why it is not so with me. Through divine favor, I have learned of the Master. I have heard him rebuke a disciple, at the very time devotion and affectionate solicitude for the welfare of his Lord, was glowing in that disciple's bosom, simply *because he was not regulated in that devotion by truth.* Let us remember, the first article is, "Whatsoever things are *true*." If truth is violated, no sincerity or devotion will screen us from the rebuke of its "faithful Witness," "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savorest not the things which be of God, but the things which be of men."

I could offer other arguments. It may be worthy of your consideration, whether there can possibly exist a person of infinite dignity, for whose worship, there is not a single precept or example in the divine record. Such you know is the fact, in respect to the Spirit as distinct from the Father. (26) Equally unaccountable is the fact, that the Son always prayed *to the Father only*, and ever expressed his dependence *on the Father only*, if it be true that he was united to a second infinite person. Surely, in connexion with such a person, he could have been no more dependent on the Father, than the Father could be on him. Let your intelligent mind take a retrospective view of your reply to me, and sift *the argument* from the eloquent assertions and illustrations with which you have adorned it. Blessed be God, we shall yet be one, beloved, in this and all truth. I know you bow to the testimony. Truth is our object. Heavenly riches pour upon us when we exchange error for it. When its lucid beams shine on our understanding, it is a mark of true greatness to say, I have been mistaken. I would not be too confident, but with the evidence before me, I feel assured that you will yet believe your own declaration that "the Father is our only God," without the confounding nullification of it, by the opinion that he is not so without two other persons or beings equal to himself. (27)

Yours, in truth and love,

HENRY GREW.

26.—No man ever worshipped the Holy Spirit from Moses to John. True, this we asserted many years ago. And what is the reason? Because without the Spirit a man cannot pray at all acceptably to God; and why should a man pray to that which is already in him? We pray to that which is above us—not to that which is in us.

27.—I have to pass over many things unnoticed, because I have not room and never consented to discuss such matters in my pages. But last of all, let me beg your attention to another consideration: The strongest points in my

New Version and Dr. Cleland.

NO. I.

SINCE the days of Wickliffe till now, every person who has made an effort to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular tongue, or to revise and improve any former translation, has been censured by the ruling Doctors of the age. We do not, therefore, think that any strange thing has happened to us, when we experience such coarse and unkind treatment for our humble, but well-meant efforts to present the sacred volume in a more intelligible form, and in a more correct and faithful translation than the popular version. We expected, however, in this age of refinement, not quite so much vulgarity and low invective from a *Doctor of Divinity* of the state of Kentucky. What the Doctor wants in logic, in evidence, and in fact, he compensates by a profusion of ungentlemanly insinuations, uncourteous epithets, and puerile abuse. We expected to share, at least in part, the fortunes of Wickliffe, of Luther, the authors of the Geneva translation, and indeed of all the reformers: for with every reformation of religion there has been a new translation of the Scriptures. Even Wesley himself, so late as is the date of his reformation, attempted a new translation of the New Testament. I say, then, we expected to be assailed from those quarters from which opposition to such undertakings has generally come. Anticipating this, we are not disappointed; and I hope it will yet appear that we have done nothing

---

reply to you are not once adverted to in your letter before me. To those which I call stronger points, I would add another. Is there any other love or affection from us due to Jesus Christ, than to our neighbor, or our brother? If he be only a creature, we ought to love him and revere him simply as a creature. I know but two sorts of love as respects the object—the love of the creature, and of the Creator. I speak not of natural affection, or animal feeling; but I speak of intellectual love, moral approbation and delight. I must give my whole affection—my undivided heart to God. All other love is in part and in subordination. With all my mind, my soul, my strength, my heart, my God requires my love. Can any creature, celestial or terrestrial, have a share in this supreme affection? I owe homage and honor to all my superiors—good will to all mankind—love to the brotherhood—gratitude to all my benefactors; but I am not commanded to love, honor, or obey any of them supremely. Is it in measure or in part that I am to love, and honor, and obey my Lord? No; just as I love, and honor, and worship the Father; so am I to love, and honor, worship the Son. Consequently, my Lord is not a creature, or idolatry is not a sin.

I am sorry to be obliged so often to remind my friend that the word *God* is a relative term; and that therefore the Father being our only God, and Jesus our only Lord, is wholly an economical arrangement in the Remedial scheme. If there had been no sin, there could have been no Christianity, no Saviour, no Prophet, no Priest, no King. Sin is the sole cause of Christianity; but it is not the cause of the creation of him that was made flesh!

When sin is forever put down, and the remedial system has achieved its end, this episode in the history of creation will cease; till then, our wisdom, our humility, and our devotion, consist in thinking and speaking of God, his anointed Saviour and the heavenly Advocate, in the words and phrases supernaturally taught us, not blending with these the cabalistic terms of human invention.

rashly, without much deliberation, and without good and relevant reasons; and that we are prepared to defend the new version as far as we are responsible to the community for the publication. We are prepared, in some measure at least, to do more than this;—to show to the conviction of every candid person, how much need there is for such a version as we have given, from an exposition of the numerous errors and palpable imperfections in the King's version. I shall do this not merely upon my own authority, but upon the authority of those whose reputation is already placed beyond the poisoned shafts of such antagonists as my friend Dr. Cleland. If I am constrained to expose the numerous blemishes, and to set in order the many mistranslations and *no*-translations found in the version of 1611—if, in going into these details and expositions, the faith of any should be weakened in a book consecrated to them by the adoption and prescription of their fathers, the blame (if blame there be) will be due to those who have imposed this duty upon me.

Our readers will yet see with what caution we have proceeded in weakening the confidence of the community in the common version; they may, perhaps, wonder that we should have proceeded even to a fourth edition and a stereotype edition of the new version, so silently and quietly, without a direct attack upon the common version. But when dragged into the field, and when compelled to sustain ourselves, disclosures may yet be made which may satisfy the intelligent, that conscientiously we could not do less than we have done in giving to our contemporaries the new version in its present improved form.

We shall, therefore, commence a series of essays in defence of the new version, which, from the variety of facts and documents necessary to our designs, we trust will prove a source of information to those who have not had opportunity to be much informed in matters of criticism, nor on the ways and means by which the present version came into their hands.

As Dr. Cleland has made it our duty to commence this series, we shall begin with his assault upon the new version, which has just come to hand in the *Western Luminary* of the 17th and 24th of July. This the Doctor (with his usual courtesy) denominates "Campbellism, Nos. 8 and 9. *New Version.*" That we may do him all justice in the presence of our readers, we shall let him tell them his own story in his own words:—

"The sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, commonly styled the New Testament. Translated from the original Greek by George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge, *Doctors of the Church of Scotland*, with prefaces," &c.

This is the lofty, imposing title of a book, in its "second edition," since 1828, and commonly called Alexander Campbell's Testament. The retail price of the first edition in Kentucky was $1 75—that of the second, $1 37 1-2. A considerable tax this, on its admirers and patrons; for at $1 25, the wholesale price of the second edition of this spurious book, the sum required for *eight* copies will procure *one hundred* of the common version in Philadelphia—so that one hundred persons can be supplied with the word of God, in the New Testament, with a sum that can supply only *eight* on the plan of modern reformation. Whether this be a money-making scheme or not, the people must

judge for themselves. We state the facts merely for information; and we can assure the reader that *information* is the principal object in our remarks on this volume—for we certainly know that a number of persons, not in Mr. Campbell's sentiments, are uninformed and imposed on respecting the true state of the case. I remark once more, this pretended translation of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, whose works are entirely separate, written at different periods, and on different portions of the New Testament, now make one book of 456 pages, and is clogged and encumbered with 124 pages of 'prefaces'—'hints to readers'—'introductions'—'prefatory hints'—and 'appendices'—with 'errata,' (in the plural,) noting only 'one omission,' and then closing with the following note of information:—"Since the publication of the first edition we have learned that Philip Doddridge, D. D. was not a Presbyterian, but a Congregationalist, or a Doctor amongst the English Independents," &c. By the reformer's own testimony, therefore, it appears at once, that the title of his book does not tell the truth; and his note, instead of helping him out of the scrape, rather plunges him deeper into the ditch; for if he found out the mistake respecting Dr. Doddridge "*since* the publication of the *first* edition," and, by inference, before the commencement of another, why was it retained in the second? Indeed, it is surprising how a man of A. Campbell's pretensions to learning and general information, should make such a gross mistake as to put Doddridge amongst the Presbyterian Doctors of the Church of Scotland, (the very place of our author's nativity and literary acquirements,) and then introduce him as such on the title page of his *first* edition. He must not censure the better informed, who protest against such conduct, whether from ignorance or design, and who take the liberty of forming their own judgments respecting the motives of the author."

Be it remembered that the Doctor's strictures are upon the second edition of the new version. He had not probably seen the third or fourth. This is not the title of the late editions of this work. The title of the late editions of this work is in the following words: "The sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, commonly styled the New Testament. Translated from the original Greek, by Doctors George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip. Doddridge. With prefaces, various emendations, and an appendix—by Alexander Campbell. *Stereotyped from the third edition, revised.* 1833." The "*errata*," not *erratum*, as he would have it, at the close of the 2d edition, are *two*—a clause omitted in the London edition, and unnoticed in the first and second editions issued by us; also, the error concerning the Doctorship of Philip Doddridge. The occasion of this error has been before explained, the reason why it was not on the title of the second edition partially given, and its expulsion from the third and fourth edition, justifies our course, and shows how undeserved are the criminations of our erudite Doctor. Reader, please observe how much the Doctor makes of this very unimportant matter, and learn from this fact how hard he has been pushed for grounds of condemnation. This and the word *immersion* compose the latitude and the longitude of his anathemas against the new version, as far as has yet appeared. He walks in the footsteps of Dr. Jennings in his remarks upon Dr. Doddridge and the word *immersion*.

Now the whole matter is this: I had not looked at the title page of Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, nor read his life at or before the time of putting to press the second edition of the new version; and seeing his works in the libraries of Presbyterians, hearing him so

often quoted and so highly commended by them, and by no others, I ranked him with the Doctors of that church. This was the head and front of my offending. I was corrected in this matter by a letter from my friend, the late *Samuel Harris*, of England, the exact date of which I do not remember; and just as soon as I could afterwards consistently correct it, I did so.

The erudite Doctor very courteously, and with all Presbyterian urbanity, calls this "the imposing, hypocritical, *lying* title page." Now, courteous reader, if I am at fault here, what shall we say of the Doctor's veracity, who positively and unhesitatingly asserts that Scotland is the place of my nativity, and that the wholesale price of the second edition was $1 25 per copy? These are matters which were as much in the power of Dr. Cleland to have ascertained as to me was the Doctorship of Philip Doddridge. Shall I for this say that Dr. Cleland is "an imposing, hypocritical *liar*," or his performance "an imposing, hypocritical, *lying* essay"? This would be to measure to him as he has measured; but in this I cannot imitate him, and will only say, How easy it is for a good and honest man sometimes to be mistaken in such little matters!

While on the price of the second edition of the new version, it may not be irrelevant to pay some attention to the foul imputation of unworthy mercenary motives which this gentleman assigns to my undertaking to introduce the new version. The reader will perceive in the previous extract with what unsparing severity the disinterested Doctor arraigns my motives in publishing this new version.

Once for all on this subject, I beg the attention of my readers. Let us see what grounds there are for this imputation. When I proposed the first edition of the new version what were the prospects? A bookseller in New York proposed an octavo edition of it at $3 00 per copy to subscribers. I subscribed in the year 1822'– 3 for 100 copies of it to encourage the publication. He failed in obtaining patronage and gave up the undertaking. His proposition was, to give the London edition, without preface or appendix, at $3 00 per copy. We, finding that it could not be introduced without much hazard and probable sacrifice of property, determined at all risks to introduce it; and proposed it at $1 75 per copy, after the model of the New York prospectus, only adding to it, in prefaces and an appendix, about 75 octavo pages in small type. This edition, in the wholesale way, brought nearly $1 50 per copy; and the second edition, a duodecimo of 456 pages, brevier, was actually wholesaled by us at $1 00 per copy. Deducting from that, *in some cases*, the transportation and a credit of 6 and 12 months, the whole edition did not average us more that 90 cents.

Again, we knew as well before we commenced this work as we do now, that uniformly translating *bapto* and *baptisma*, IMMERSE and IMMERSION, would as certainly operate against the circulation and sale of the works among all the Paidobaptists; and that the Presbyterian and other clergy would as infallibly, on that account alone, denounce it from Dan to Beersheba, as that a Doctor of Divinity will

obey a call to 1000 dollars per annum rather than to one of 500. Moreover, we knew full well that the Regular Baptists themselves, far from as liberal as the Presbyterians, in supporting the works devoted to their sectarian peculiarities, would not thank us for our services, nor reward us for any sacrifice we had to make in their defence. They have not disappointed us, except in a few cases, like that of George Waller, who prayerfully committed the first edition to the flames.

Such were my golden prospects in putting to press the first edition of this work. I am not more disinterested than I ought to be; yet I am of the opinion that few booksellers, or Presbyterian preachers, would, with the prospects before me, have risked three or four thousand dollars in performing such a service at such a time. How far these facts and documents warrant such imputations is left to the candid reader.

But insinuations are also made by the same charitable gentleman on the ground of securing the copy-right of this work, as if this were an unequivocal proof of mercenary motives. This will be received by many who understand not these matters, as direct proof of his insinuations. Yet the Doctor would be very far from drawing such an inference from the conduct of his own brethren, or of such worthy, pious, and distinguished authors of translations and editions of the New Testament, or parts of the New Testament, as have recently issued from the presses of Presbyterian and Congregational Doctors of Divinity, some of whom are twice paid for their literary and theological labors before they put them to the press.

I know some Doctors who are first paid as preachers—who are again paid for the same divinity as theological lecturers in schools of divinity—and a third time paid as editors and publishers, for the same divinity, and every time at a very high price.

This, however, is rather an evidence of their piety and devotion than otherwise. But if we labor for a life time in similar literary and religious studies, without money and without price; and we publish any thing at from 50 to 75 per cent. lower than the booksellers' regular price for *original works*, we are then unequivocally demonstrated to be mercenary in our motives, and impious in all our labors.

Take, for example, the translation and commentary of Professor Stuart on the Hebrews and Romans—*copy-right secured—price, eight dollars in boards.* How many New Testaments would this purchase from the Bible Society or some other great book manufactory in New York or Philadelphia? Is not the Professor, learned, and pious, and disinterested as he is, paid something for lecturing on these aforesaid epistles? Does not the Theological School of Andover afford him a handsome salary per annum? And is not the same biblical criticism and divinity exhibited in print, at the moderate price of $4 00 an epistle? And would Dr. Cleland thence argue that he is wholly a mercenary theologian?

Is it proof positive that the Rev. Hervey Wilbur is mercenary because he has published thirteen editions of the common Testament,

with some tables, and *the copy-right secured*, stereotyped in pocket form, at from 50 to 75 cents, according to paper and binding, per copy. But there is no need to adduce instances of this sort; for if not universally, it is very generally the course pursued by all the authors, translators, and theologians of the age. Men as purely disinterested as was Charles Thompson, who sold his new translation at 10 dollars, copy-right secured, are in this practice without imputation.

But, perhaps, the secret is this: Our opponents expect perfection in us, and imperfection in themselves; and therefore a copy-right for a religious work is in us criminal in the first degree!

We have given our reasons in the preface to the appendix of the stereotype edition. Our object has been to perfect this translation, and to have it as cheap as the common Testament. For this purpose, chiefly, and for the purpose of *mere indemnification*, we have reserved the copy-right. Some additions to the appendix of the pocket Testament may yet be necessary, and when this is completed we will afford license to any publisher, without any remuneration, to publish as many copies as he pleases.

We now wholesale the work at 40 cents per copy, neatly and substantially bound; and for cash at 37 1-2 by the quantity. When the extra quantity of matter (which is nearly 100 pages more than the common Testament) is taken into the account, it is already as cheap as the common Testament, done up in the same style. And should we use very coarse paper, and have it bound in the most common style, it may be sold at 25 cents. On very fine paper, and morocco pocket book binding and gilding, at 75 cents, the Philadelphia price of the common Testament, done up in the first style. Thus, after much labor and very great expense, we have got the new version perfected and ready for delivery at the same price of the common version, page for page, and executed in the same style. This is the goal—the desideratum which we have labored to attain.

These things premised, we are now prepared to take up and examine all objections to the version, and to tender the reasons why we have progressed so slowly in each edition in correcting and perfecting the translation. We shall show that every objection, on the ground of phraseology, lies equally against the common version.—We have now before us two copies of the Geneva Bible, of 1607 and 1615, printed by King James' Printer, the celebrated Robert Barker, exhibiting some thousands of variations in the same period of time which we have spent on the new translation. And this is the strongest and most plausible objection that can be urged against any version. We shall show in the sequel that no version in the English language is more exempt from the imputation of change and emendation than that which we have completed. And whatever change, alteration, or improvement may be found in this version, which cannot be sustained by the established canons of criticism, by the highest literary authorities, we shall as frankly surrender as our mistake concerning the Doctorship of Philip Doddridge; for instead of being a Doctor of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, he was only a Doctor of the

Congregational Church of England. And yet, in America, both sit in the same General Assembly of the *Presbyterian Church!!*

EDITOR.

[*Mr. Waterman being in attendance at Conference, and not expecting to hear from him in time for the present number, I proceed to offer a postscript to my last letter, which was cut short for the want of room.*]

MR. WATERMAN:

Dear Sir—

SOME minute matters, detached from the main argument in your last letter to me, require a remark or two.

The pith and marrow of your argument in favor of some *insignificant* influence (i. e. an influence without words or signs) exerted upon the human mind by the Spirit, is very candidly expressed in the following words: "The source of thought is unknown.—of course a foreign agent may act on our minds through mediums unknown to us." But it may not: and thus you very candidly give up the proof of such an agency.

You, my dear sir, are too good a logician to urge as an argument in favor of any affirmative proposition, its mere possibility. Suppose I should presume to prove that you were the cause of the secession in the Methodist Episcopal Church, called the Radicals: you would doubtless call upon me for positive proof. In reply, I would say that you were a very zealous republican, a very powerful and eloquent pleader for the rights of man, and that you deservedly exercised an immense moral influence in the Methodist society. I would next go on to expatiate on the various ways in which a person may influence others without making use of direct words or signs, to persuade to any particular course; and from a variety of inductions declarative of the mysteriousness of human influence, and the indescribable ways and manners in which one person influenced another, would then very gravely conclude by saying, on the authority of Paley, Reid, and Stewart, that "the source of thought is unknown," and of course in a way which you never thought, you *may have acted* upon the minds of some brethren to move such a reform as the Radicals contemplate. What would be your reply? Sir, you would say, that is all supposition; a thousand *may bes* would not make one proof. In so saying, you would reason like a man and a philosopher.

Having thus disposed of all the evidence adduced in favor of your favorite position, I shall offer a remark on your good humor and raillery upon my saying that angels assume the form of a man, of some creature, of a thought. "The form of a thought." This you call "a bran new idea." "I have heard," you say, "of the *quality* of thoughts, but this is the first time that I have heard of their *form*." Perhaps you have forgotten. Words are often called the image, or sign of a

thought. Language itself is beautifully called "painted thought." Shakspeare says, if I mistake not, that written language gives to thought

"A local habitation and a name."

The transition from sign, image, and local habitation, to *form*, is short and easy. All symbolic figures, and all historic paintings, are only giving to thought a visible form. And this is precisely what I mean by assuming the form of a thought. By presenting as in visions, dreams, certain figures, images, symbols, or forms of thought in the mind of men, I know not why an angel could not as readily assume a symbol in the mind, as easily, as a painter form his idea of Abraham on canvass. I have seen boys originate thoughts in the minds of their schoolfellows, and tempt them to action, without a word addressed to the ear. And have not spirits got so much acquaintance with the minds of men, as to know their associations of ideas? and can they not, from such acquaintance, lead the mind into any particular train? When then, my dear sir, you talk of forming the mind of a child, (a phrase very current,) if you will reflect on the propriety of forming the mind, you will find that the form of the mind, and the form of thought, are all of the same lineage and family.

Do you not, my dear sir, make an illogical demand of me when you ask me to prove that God always employed signs, or words, in communicating his will to his Son? This is not a case in point. But if it were, I would still hesitate upon its legitimacy: for if I prove that God sometimes communicated his will by words and signs, and you can bring no case in which he communicated his mind in any other manner, it is wholly unnecessary for me to prove that he always did so.

Please accept an illustration: Suppose A affirms that a foreigner must, in these United States, be naturalized before he can have a vote; and when put to the proof, he mentions some ten or a dozen cases in which naturalization was actually required in order to the right of suffrage. Suppose his antagonist, B, cannot produce an instance of an unnaturalized person being accepted at the polls—is it necessary, to sustain the position of A, that he must, by an induction of all the foreigners that ever voted, show that *always*, and in every case, the alien was naturalized before he voted, or are the instances given, and the failure of B to adduce an exception, to be admitted as proof? So reason and logic arbitrate this matter. Or suppose that I find in the New Testament that baptism, in some instances, preceded the right to a seat at the Lord's table, and that no man can show that, since the date of the commission, any unbaptized person eat the Lord's supper; may I not, without enumerating and examining every case in the volume, logically conclude that baptism is a prerequisite to a seat at the Lord's table?

You have as yet failed to convince me that there is a *radical* difference between the Calvinist and the Arminian. I admit that there is a prodigious war of words between them; but while they both con-

tend for "*assistance out of the word*" as essential to what they call "*saving* faith," and that this assistance is *special*, they are one at the root, while they may differ as to the degree or amount of special aid.

In attempting to remove this difficulty, you do not begin at the beginning, but in the second chapter of the volume. You say: "They agree that we must have a power or assistance *out of the word*, and accordingly pray for it." You have given me a *praying* Arminian, and a *praying* Calvinian; but are not these both believers! or do you suppose that, without this aid, they can pray acceptably! This is quite out of my chapter. I hold that "without faith it is impossible to please God;" and that prayer before faith, for special aid, is a positive contradiction in fact. If you commence your illustration of the need of special aid in order to faith with a praying person seeking for aid, you begin at the second chapter, and your case is wholly without point; for you have a person praying for what he has got!!

A greater than Paley, or Reid, or Locke, or Stewart, must arise and found a new system of philosophy, before I can be convinced that special aid is more wanting for the second duty, than for the first. If you have got the man on his knees without special aid, he may get along pretty well. If you have him believing and praying without this special aid, you cannot afterwards regard it as either essential to faith or prayer.

Your other illustrations have all the same fault with the first;—not one of them comes to the point. You say, "The Arminian believes that by virtue of the remedial scheme of Christianity, all men are, at *all times*, in possession of a power to believe." "But," you say, "the Calvinist believes that we cannot believe *savingly*, until we receive what he calls the special *call*." Well, now, his special call, and your special influence out of the word, are only two names for the same thing: for while with you all men have at all times power to believe, they do not all believe, or they do not all exert that power. They want some aid, out of the word, to exert that power. And does it not come to this: The Calvinist says all men have not power, the Arminian says all men have power to believe, but they have not power to exert that power, without special divine influence!!!

Notwithstanding all your reasonings, I must still regard you with your special influence out of the word, and the Calvinist with his special call out of the word, as radically, essentially, virtually, and cordially one. And since the days of James Arminius until now, John Calvin and he, with all their armies, have been fighting about shadows, words, signs and *forms* of ideas.

You very gravely tell me, "Now my dear sir, you can certainly distinguish between a power to do a thing without any foreign aid, and a power to co-operate with aid when offered." Yes, my friend Waterman, I can very easily see the difference; but do you see that this comes not within the volume of our investigation at all? Or am I to suppose that the Calvinist contends for a power to do without foreign aid, and the Arminian for a power to co-operate with foreign aid? Pray, whom do you thus describe? Which of the belligerents

contends for a power to do a thing without foreign aid? and who for a power to co-operate with aid? If the latter be the Arminian, I am sure the former is not the Calvinist. Thus I can see no relevancy in this illustration.

Dr. Paley, whose words you quote, did not understand the matter as well as yourself —you are better without him. He only weakens your cause: for his whole logic terminates here, "The doctrine is mysterious." His doctrine of "religious states of the soul," and of "the spark" that is wanting; his doctrine of "voluntary endeavor," and "that it may be more *ordinarily* true that the gift of the Spirit is holden out to the *struggling*, the *endeavoring*, the *approaching Christian*," are wholly human and unapostolic. This "struggling, endeavoring, and approaching Christian," is, like the Sphinx or the Centaur, the creature of imagination. His doctrine of a proposition being *ordinarily true*, is most unphilosophic. Can a proposition be ordinarily true, and yet extraordinarily false! I know his meaning, but it is no better than his style. I repeat it, my dear sir, these philosophers injure your cause; you can manage it incomparably better without them.

You tell me of the days of yore, and would assign my obtusity to distinguish between Calvinism and Arminianism, to the influence of my having preached "Blue Stocking Calvinism." Very charitable, indeed! Your perspicacity is, then, to be ascribed to your always having preached pure and unmixed Arminianism. Doubtless you ought, then, to understand it better than Calvinism. But if we could suppose a person who had preached both, he would, on your logic, be unable to understand either. Or, shall we infer that he could understand both better than either of us! You have been dyed in the wool, and are therefore the true blue of Arminianism! This is all good logic with some folks; but, sir, between you and me, it passes for no more than a laugh to please the vulgar, or an attempt to attaint the blood because of the sin of a remote progenitor. Your pristine and primitive Arminianism, and my former and primitive Calvinism, have no logic, and but little rhetoric in an argument upon what says the Bible?

You are "not trammelled with the prejudices of education"! for it seems you were always as you now are. You say you were taken *out of* the wild olive, and are not trammelled by the prejudices of education. I am peculiarly happy in having found one correspondent who never had to unlearn any thing, but who was naturally, educationally, and religiously right from the beginning. Rest assured, my dear sir, that it will give me much pleasure to see you still go forward in a straight line, till you terminate in the perfect knowledge of the One Book.

Having now noticed all the points in your letter, I am prepared to confine myself to the point, the capital point which we have selected.

Very sincerely yours,

EDITOR.

Epaphras---No. 9.

Dear Sir,

IN my intercourse with religious society I hear it often said that you and your fellow-laborers are industriously building a party, a sect as exclusive in its nature, and as illiberal to others, as any Protestant sect in the land. To the latter epithet, "illiberal," I have not hesitated to object as undeserved and gratuitous. I have attempted to show that great liberality (I should say, indulgence) was professed by all the reformers to variety of opinion; and, indeed, I would rather complain of latitudinarianism, than of illiberality or fastidiousness in respect to the sentiments and opinions of those with whom you fraternize.

But may I be permitted to say, that there seems an over-zealousness and an over-weaning anxiety for conformity to some views and a too great laxness in regard to others. But that which at present most presses upon my attention, is, the want of uniformity in the order of your meetings. On one of my late excursions through the adjoining counties, I found several congregations which could not be distinguished from those societies you call popular, in any thing I heard or saw; save that the doctrine preached smacked a little of reformation. The same itching ear for a good preacher, and the same listlessness when he was absent, characterised the audience. I saw no Lord's table in two congregations at which I personally attended; and yet they were called Reformers. Indeed, if I had had no other data to guide my judgment than what I there saw, I could not have learned that Jesus shed his blood for our sins, nor that he ever rose from the dead. I heard, it is true, a text, to that effect, once quoted; but as to any thing I saw in the observances of the day, I could not have decided whether the congregation felt any peculiar interest in the Lord's day or the Christian institution. I hope there are not many such in the circuit of the Reformation. But one thing grieved me much—I saw but two New Testaments and one Bible in a congregation which reports 94 members. And in the whole course of the day I heard but one verse read and about seven quoted; of course the people must have a very high regard for the wisdom and knowledge of the orator, and but little for the unadulterated milk of the word. But, perhaps, it would not be altogether fair to estimate their regard for each by the rule of proportion, and say, that as 5 minutes are to 120 minutes, so is the respect for the word of God to that for the word of man.

The young disciples, or the old either, cannot grow in the knowledge of God under these small rations per day. And from various conversations had with members, who I doubt not are about at par value for information in the societies to which they belong, I think, in all charity, something ought to be done to enlighten them in the Holy Scriptures.

Do say something on this; and especially on the subject of the sectarian aspect of the Reformation. On this you have said a good

deal, which would satisfy me; yet I think you have no where definitely exposed what constitutes a sect, in that sense which Christianity condemns.

I see you are pretty much crowded with numerous and voluminous correspondents; and that I may not be oppressive on your pages, I will, till you have got more room, make my communications short.

In all sincerity, yours,

EPAPHRAS.

Reply to Epaphras.

Dear Sir,

IN my last number I mentioned two of yours as being on hand; but forgot that one of them was published, though yet unanswered. In the hundred incidents of every day which call my attention, some of them must be put off with too much despatch. Thus your letter, No. 8, appeared in May, and till this hour it is not answered. Well, what shall I say? for on reading it over, it requires no answer—it speaks for itself; and I see nothing in it to censure—nothing to except—nothing to illustrate—nothing to confirm. I shall, then, let these remarks stand for my answer to it, and proceed to that just now laid before my readers.

I think you must be sometimes unfortunate in your excursions, and that you fall in with churches and disciples that are not worthy of their profession as *Reformers.*

But to attend to the items in order, I would observe that there is more than a mere grammatical difference between the phrases "Christian sect," and "a sect of Christians." Plain as this matter is to you and me, until the Lord comes Christians will be a sect, or there will be a Christian sect in the world. Christians were a sect in the days of Paul—a sect, a heresy, a schism, every where disparaged. But Christian sects, or sects amongst Christians, began soon as the leaven of Antichrist began to work, and they are as rampant, as numerous, and as heterogeneous as ever. Christian sects, or sects among Christians, is as monstrous a growth as two bodies for one soul, or as a plurality of bodies with one head. Nothing can be more unseemly—nothing more unnatural.

There never can, however, in right reason nor in scriptural propriety, be more than one Christian sect. And that sect, be it found where it may, is the chaste bride of Christ. She is one, and only one, and indivisible. She is wedded to Christ. The New Testament, the living oracles, is her marriage covenant. Remission of sins and an inheritance with Christ is her marriage dowry. She is in fact *Christian.* And although another may assume that name, still she is an adulteress if she consort with any other, and live not agreeably to the marriage covenant.

There is but one Lord, one body, and one Spirit. Jesus is that one Lord—the people united to him on the living oracles is the one body—and the spirit which animates that one body is the Holy Spirit of God. All sects but this one are harlots, and their little covenants are

only licences to depart from the bed and board of their acknowledged husband.

To take another figure, the Christian sect is a nation, a holy nation. And, like every other nation, this one has its own constitution, laws, institutions, manners, customs, privileges. They have one immersion, one table, one book, one day in the week, one festival which is national. Every little society has its own by-laws and regulations, not one of which contravene the national institutions—the constitution, laws, ordinances, manners, customs, privileges.

Now to come to the point: We are zealous for all the national peculiarities; and if this make us a sect, it is positive proof that all others are not zealous for all the national institutions, but have got up some of their own. We cannot sacrifice one of these institutions for the sake of being unsectarian; for should we lose any of the characteristics of the Christian sect, and then be unsectarian in the world's estimation, we would be repudiated by the Head—and be like our neighbors.

Suppose we should lay aside one institution found in the book, this would make us like some other sect, and we should then be obnoxious to the curse hanging over the daughters of the Mother of Harlots. It cannot be. We are the only society on earth who build upon the living oracles alone. Every society has its own little covenant, creed, or discipline; or leaves out some one or other of the Christian institutions. The Baptist sect formerly held fast the constitution of the Christian kingdom, and had no creed or discipline but the living oracles. But now she, like the others, has played the harlot, and is as wanton as any of her sisters.

I would define the Christian sect to be those who believe and do the things taught and enjoined by Jesus and his Apostles; and a sect of Christians is a body that acknowledges Jesus to be the Lord, but add to his institutions a few of their own, or subtract from this some one or more which is not acceptable to them.

Such is every one in this land known to me out of the ranks of this reformation—call them Christian, Methodist, Episcopalian, Baptist, or what you please.

But you say you find some churches much in the back ground. Well, so were some in the age of the Apostles, who needed milk rather than bread and beef; and for being such the Apostles reproved them.

A church, meeting for worship and edification, without reading the oracles or hearing the Apostles read every Lord's day, is not in the path of her duty, and cannot grow in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. But I am relieved from replying directly to this part of your communication, having been very express on this topic in my late *Extra*, which doubtless you have already seen.

Every disciple ought to have with him a copy of the New Testament, at least every time he goes to the school of Christ; and, with that book in his hand, he should either read, hear, examine, speak, as the case may be, for his own edification and that of his brethren.

This is now, and long has been the case in some congregations of the disciples; and I doubt not it will yet be more general, and finally universal in all the assemblies of the saints.

In much affection and esteem,

EDITOR.

Conversation at Mr. Goodal's.

[*Continued from page* 314.]

Mr. Williamson.—BUT, Mr. Reed, in giving so wide a range to the ministry of good angels, must we not necessarily infer that there is a ministry of evil angels on a scale of equal magnitude.

Mr. Reed. As to the comparative number of evil angels, or the comparative extent of their agency in tempting and opposing our race, revelation is silent. But that there is an immense number of them, and that they never cease their assaults upon our race, is clearly proposed in the Jewish, but especially in the Christian Scriptures.

Father Goodal. I am glad that you have broached that subject. Let us give to it a practical turn. For the last thirty years of my life I have discovered an increasing reluctance on the part of both preachers and authors to descant much upon Satanic influence. Whether the jibes and sneers of sceptics have prevailed over the good sense, intelligence, and devotion of our teachers, or whether it is to be ascribed to the growing intelligence of the age, I will not rashly affirm; but so it is, that I would be induced to think that Satan had abandoned our race, or made but few and short visits to our world, or had become more friendly to us than in the days of yore, if my judgment was to be formed from the majority of authors and preachers with whom I have formed an acquaintance in these latter years of my life.

Mr. Reed. Indeed, Father Goodal, I fear we are too much influenced by the growing scepticism of our age. If we have not less faith than formerly, we appear to have less courage. The ridicule cast upon religion in latter years, and especially upon a spiritual religion, has shaped the course of many. They think, perhaps, to make religion more respectable in the eyes of philosophers by dressing it up in their style, and by departing from the style of the old-fashioned Prophets and Apostles—as if they, poor humble souls, lived in an age of darkness and were under the influence of the errors and superstitions of the age! I witness this apostacy from scriptural style and language with much concern; and very often I hear a sermon without the word Christ or Devil in it.

Father Goodal. Well, brother Reed, I yet believe that our adversary the Devil ever goes about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. I do not think he has reformed or grown less hostile to our race in 6000 years; nay, if he is not more hostile, more cunning, and more active now than when he made his first assault on Eve, I am certain he is no less intent on the eternal ruin of every one that is born of woman.

Mr. Williamson. Might not, then, the subject of his temptations and assaults be of some service to us all?

Mrs. Fowler. I have had my mind considerably exercised upon this subject, and for some days past the temptation of Christ in the wilderness has been a common topic in my family.

Mrs. Reed. And not more than two weeks since I was asking my husband at home whether we were to consider Matthew iv. as allegorical, or as a literal narrative of what had actually happened in the wilderness of Judea.

Father Goodal. As it fared with the Master, so we may expect it to fare with the servant. Now as the subject of Satanic influence opens in the New

Testament history with the temptation of the Messiah, I am of opinion that it i the proper beginning of the subject, if we wish to understand it fully.

Robert Fowler. While attending the last Assize in the Court of King's Sessions, in our county of Down, at the last term, a criminal was indicted fo murdering one of his neighbors; and in reading the indictment, when the words "Without the fear of God before your eyes, and at the instigation of the Devil," &c. were pronounced, a person standing by whispered in my ear, "Is the Devil omnipresent? While he was instigating this criminal, he was charged with a hundred murders in the four quarters of the world, which all happened at the same time." I knew not what reply to make. I have since asked several persons, who seemed to be as much non-plussed as myself. I hope that some light may be thrown upon this subject in the course of the conversation.

Mr. Reed. I confess there are some difficulties in my way of understanding satisfactorily some things in the temptations offered to the Messiah, yet the general scope appears intelligible enough.

Father Goodal. Let Maria recite the narrative as it reads in Matthew. I think I heard her repeat off the book the first eight chapters of Matthew a few evenings since.

Maria Goodal—[after repeating the narrative]—May I be permitted to ask a previous question, which will at least prepare my mind to understand the subject?

Mr. Reed. Say on, Maria; we have not yet decided where to begin.

Maria Goodal. What are we to understand by this long fast of forty days? Why was it necessary; and did it become the occasion of this temptation?

Mr. Reed. All the circumstances must be attentively considered, if we would comprehend a subject of so much difficulty and interest, as the conflict between the Messiah and Satan. The circumstances of this temptation appear to have been the following:—

The Messiah had just been baptized. While he was ascending from the Jordan the Spirit of God was descending from heaven, and the Father was saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I delight." Here we have the sacred three—Jesus on earth—the Spirit, in the form of a dove—and the Father, speaking in heaven. After such a bright and glorious display, Jesus retires from the gaze and hides himself in the wilderness, far from the abodes of men; for there was no place nigh the Jordan in which the wild beasts were wont to roam. Unassuming modesty and an ardent desire for communion with God his Father, urged him into the depths of the wilderness. In forty days, like Elijah, he may have gone even to Horeb, and with Moses and Elijah, fasted his forty days on the same ground.

Mr. Williamson. Where do we learn that Elijah fasted forty days at Horeb?

Mr. Reed. By referring to 1 Kings, iii. 8. you will find that from Beersheba, the southern extremity of the promised land, Elijah started, and after going one day's journey in the wilderness, and resting under a juniper tree, an angel met him and refreshed him. He then went on to Horeb, the mountain on which Moses fasted forty days, and there he fasted as long. Into the same wilderness our Saviour retired, fasted for the same time, and probably on the very same theatre where these illustrious servants of God fasted and communed with their heavenly Father.

Mrs. Reed. This is my favorite proof of the importance and utility of *fasting*. When I read of the mighty Moses, the man of God—and of the renowned and flaming Elijah, of seraphic zeal—and of my Saviour, the Lord of all, fasting forty days each, and communing with the God of heaven in reference to the great labors that lay before them; how my soul approves and delights in this sweet means of communion with God, and of retirement from the world!

Mr. Williamson. Fasting, Mrs. Reed! What fasting? Would you have Christians to fast?

Mrs. Reed. Most certainly I would. Did not my Saviour say, "When you my disciples fast, anoint your head and wash your face, that your fasting may

not appear to men, but to your Father; and your Father, to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will recompense you." This is enough for me. My Saviour fasted forty days at one time. It was miraculous, indeed, to continue so long; but he fasted more than this, and he commanded his disciples to fast, and that is enough for me.

Mr. Williamson. The command seems to me not so clear. He does not say, Fast; but, "When you fast."

Mrs. Reed. But that is not all, though that for me is enough. Any thing that ever Jesus Christ did, which I can do, is most acceptable and delightful; but he said more than this. He said that when he should leave his disciples they would fast—*and they did fast.* I have some proofs of this in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles.

Mr. Reed. Meanwhile let us not forget the subject. You may talk that matter over again; but now we are all engaged in ascertaining the meaning of the temptation of the Messiah.

Mr. Williamson. One question, Mr. Reed—Was not Jesus *led up* into the wilderness by Satan, rather than *retire* there of his own accord?

Mr. Reed. Not led by *Satan;* for Mark and Luke explain this leading. The Spirit, recollect, possessed him. It descended upon him and remained on him. Mark tells the whole story in one period: "Immediately after this the Spirit conveyed him into the wilderness; and he continued in the wilderness forty days, tempted by Satan, and was among the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him." Luke says, "He was led by the Spirit into the wilderness;" and, indeed, Matthew says the same—"He was led up [from the Jordan] by the Spirit." It was the Spirit of God that thus influenced him. His being among the wild beasts indicates how far he had penetrated the wilderness.

Father Goodal. You have no doubt observed, brother Reed, that Luke does not place the different attacks of Satan in the same order.

Mr. Reed. Matthew ends with the high mountain, and Luke with the battlement of the temple. They both relate the same particulars, but not in the same order. Matthew, however, seems to fix his attention upon the order as respects time, while Luke narrates them without respect to that order.

Mr. Williamson. Did not Satan, think you, know that he was the Son of God?

Mr. Reed. He had doubtless heard the attestation given to Jesus from heaven; but he seems not to have understood its import, more than the Jews. He uses not the phrase *the* Son of God, but, *a* Son of God. And this, perhaps, was the occasion of this trial. Determined to deride the character and standing of Jesus, he accosts him with great address, and in the most natural train of circumstances. Finding him without food, among the wild beasts alone and unaided; enfeebled too, it may be supposed, by abstinence—with all these advantages on his side, and according to the circumstances of the whole case, he adroitly says: "If you be a Son of God, command these stones to become loaves." His confidence in God and resignation to his will, is tried in this appeal. But there is no yielding to the temptation. By *It is written,* he thrusts his antagonist. Satan doubtless assumes some form, human or angelic; for he never comes, as a tempter, holding forth his cloven foot. There would be no temptation at all if he showed himself to be Satan; for who would think of obeying Satan, if he were to appear in his proper character?

From this I infer that in all these attempts Satan was concealed, either under the form of an angel of light, or of some human sage or chief. Nor are we to suppose that he instantly seized him and carried him to the battlement of the temple in Jerusalem, nor to Mount Pisgah, but that he invited him to these places of observation by some specious argument; and Jesus, determined to give him a fair opportunity, went from post to post, and gave him his choice of ground, but yielded nothing in the temptation. After finding his confidence ni God, and his willingness to live upon any thing which God appointed, unconquerable, he thought next of pushing this confidence into *presumption,* by inducing him, on the promises of God, to precipitate himself from the battlement of the temple.

Mr. Williamson. Did not Satan suppress a part of the promise which he quoted from the 91st Psalm?

Mr. Reed. Yes, like some of our Doctors, he left out what did not suit his purpose; if he had quoted the words "He shall keep you in all your ways," it would at once have discomfitted his attack. But this he cunningly suppresses, and aims at making the victory which Jesus had gained before through his confidence in God, the occasion of such presumption as would have proved his ruin. For in this lies the policy and strength of the temptation. But he is again cut to pieces by the sword of the Spirit.

There yet remains another side on which to attack him; viz: his ambition. But how will he find a proper bait? He induces him, as Balak did Balaam, to accompany him to a very high mountain; not a *visionary* mountain from which he could see both hemispheres, the one immersed in night and the other in day, at the same moment; but he takes him up to Pisgah, or to the mountain described by Mariti in his travels round that country, "which overlooks the mountains of Arabia, the country of Gilead, the plains of Moab, the plains of Jericho, the river Jordan, the whole extent of the Dead Sea." *The world,* by the Jews, was often another name for *the whole land* which God showed from a mountain to Abraham; for the Hebrew *haarets*, and the Greek *ge*, are frequently rendered both *land* and *world.*

At this time this land was divided into several kingdoms, or governments, partitioned under the sons of Herod, Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip.

This bait was large enough, as Satan thought, for one solitary in the wilderness without food; but had he known him to be *the Son of God*, all the kingdoms of the four quarters of the globe would have been an insufficient bait, and he would not have tried him with such an offer. Thus his ambition was tried. But Jesus names him out, and by the sword of the Spirit drives him off. Satan, completely routed, leaves him for a while.

Father Goodal. This well sustains your former position, that spirits, good or evil, aiming at influencing us morally, must always approach us by *arguments*—words or signs intelligible.

Mr. Williamson. But can we show that always temptations are thus addressed to us in words or signs?

Mr. Reed. This is not necessary for us. We can show it in many instances; and who can show one of another sort? We say in reason, it cannot be that moral or immoral actions can be instigated by physical touches or impulses. We must have signs, significant and intelligible, else there can be no temptation.

EDITOR.

Stuart on Baptism.

NO. III.

THE Professor next tries the circumstances attending the administration of baptism;—in the Jordan, and at Enon; and much water, or many waters; and going down to, or into; and coming up from, or out of, &c. all may, by the great force and power of criticism, be explained away, or so explained as merely to leave room for a single doubt, to constitute one pin upon which to hang up sprinkling or pouring. If a word be not forever fixed to one sense, on our Professor's logic, it can never fix any matter on the basis of infallible certainty—and he wants infallible certainty. Suppose, for example, *anabaino* could be shown to mean *emerge;* yet, if it cannot be shown to emerge out of fire, or water, or milk, or honey, or air, or some other

liquid, it will not produce infallible certainty. And inasmuch as *eis* does not forever mean *into*, it never can infallibly prove that Jesus went *into heaven*, or that the devil shall go *into hell*. Indeed, there is no possibility of fixing the meaning of any rite, ordinance, or duty, unless the words that teach them have but one meaning. If *baptizo* one thousand times signifies literally to *immerse*, in all authors, classical and sacred; yet, if it can be found once *metonymically* translated *wash*, then it may be made a question whether that washing was performed by *smearing*, sprinkling, or pouring!!! If *eis* mean *into* 99 times in one hundred, yet if it can only be fairly proved once to mean *to*, then it is wholly uncertain whether Jesus Christ, or any one else, was ever immersed in Jordan, or at Enon, or in any river, pool, or bath.

I am sorry to see so much of this sort of criticism coming from a writer whom, in general, I so highly esteem; to see him set up a court of inquiry, a tribunal, before which not a word in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, could be infallibly ascertained. He frankly acknowledges that *baptizo* signifies immerse, in classic and sacred use; and that in no instance he has found it rendered, or susceptible of being rendered, *sprinkle* or *pour*.

Many will no doubt ask, How does the Professor, after all the admissions which we have copied into our two previous Nos. justify himself in continuing the practice of sprinkling? or rather, How can he be content to live and die without baptism? The question, be it proposed in whatever words the querist pleases, is fully answered by our liberal Professor in the words following, to wit: "The *external* mode of an *external* rite never can, with my present views of Christianity, become to me a matter of any peculiar interest, in any other point of view than merely that of a historical fact. My full belief (opinion) is, that since 'God is a Spirit,' he seeks worshippers in spirit and in truth; and that when the *heart* is given to him, the manner of external rites can never be essential. These may concern the *costume* of the church, but never her glorious person."—*Biblical Repository*, p. 332.

To this the Quaker would say *Amen*, if the Spirit would permit him to use a word so external. Why, then, were ever any external rites, or external modes of observing external rites, ordained by God! Why was Uzzah struck dead for touching the Ark externally when his heart was given to God, and so full of zeal for the safety of the sacred chest? Why was there ever any external form appointed for doing any thing in religion, if it matters not how it be externally performed? Why was an external act made the test of Adam's integrity, and the condition on which his life or death was to depend? That all the ruin which has come upon our race has come through an external act in reference to an external institution, speaks a lesson not soon to be forgotten.

But this phrase, "the *external* mode of an *external* rite," is to me wholly unintelligible. I will therefore propound to the learned Professor some questions on it, for information—

Is baptism to be considered as an external rite? Suppose that it is answered in the affirmative; then I ask, Can there be any other than an external mode of administering and receiving it? Can an external rite be obeyed any other way than externally? If God, for example, command me to be sprinkled with water, do I obey that command by being immersed in water? or rather, do I obey that command by giving my heart to him? I contend that he that obeys not an external rite externally, obeys it not at all:—that it is as impossible for him to obey it in his heart, as it is by his heart to put clothes on the naked, or food into the mouth of the hungry. If I am right, then there is something at stake of peculiar interest—something of more importance than this essay of 100 pages—to which the Professor would do well to take heed.

But again—Is baptism an *internal rite!* Who gave it that name? Dr. Antichrist christened it, by sprinkling it in the name of St. Peter, about the year 1100. From the Pope, and not from Moses, Elijah, Jesus, or Paul, derived we this new nomenclature! What is an external rite? Bowing, kneeling, standing, praying, singing, commemorating the Lord's supper, observing the Lord's day, may all be called, if any one pleases, external rites. So may giving alms, fasting, and every thing that requires the tongue, hand, head, or foot, to move; all may be called external rites, if any one pleases to use words at random.

But will the Professor please explain to us what an *internal* rite means? For I reason thus: that if there be rites which are fitly called *external*, there must be some contradistinguished from them by being fitly called *internal rites*. I wait for light upon this subject; for it is to me, as yet, dark as midnight.

Again: That I may understand the Professor with all clearness and comprehension, I respectfully ask for an explanation of the *internal* mode of observing external rites. The Professor will perceive that these are fair consequences from his syllogisms: for if there be an external mode which is of no concern to him, there must be an *internal* mode which is of infinite importance. I now ask, Can there be expressed in language, can there be a definition given, of the internal mode of observing an internal rite, or an external rite!

Great and eminent men, as learned as our justly celebrated Professor, have fallen into both great and small errors: and if he is not deceived by a verbiage without ideas—by false reasoning—I shall be most happy in being convinced of it. As at present advised, I regard this sentence, as above quoted, as the *fons et principium* of the wrong conclusions of our much esteemed and highly celebrated Professor.

But I have something still more grave to say to the Professor, on the subject of worshipping God in spirit and in truth, by making light of the external mode of an external rite.

In our last edition of the New Version, as stereotyped, we read—*God is Spirit*. There is no *a* in the proposition. Gabriel is *a* spirit; and this may be said of any spirit in the universe. But Jesus said more than that God is *a* spirit. He affirmed that God is Spirit, and

that they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth. Can he be worshipped in truth, while his commandments (whether external actions or internal actions be required) are disobeyed, or held as matters of indifference? On this we may make some remarks in our next.

EDITOR.

Bethany, Brooke co. Va. August 6, 1833.

Barton W. Stone:

Respected Brother—I AM sorry to find that you disapprove of my remarks upon N. W—'s view of the Atonement. That I did not acquit myself better, you impute to a deficiency in my commencement as a reformer. You say: "You appear, when you entered on reformation, to have had your eye so fixed on a few prominent principles, that you had not time to examine some doctrines that you had before received as truth; and, therefore, have brought them along with you from that vortex in which you had been tossed for years." I must confess myself quite at a loss to perceive how you came to this conclusion from my letter to brother Thompson; and sure I am, had you seen and considered our Declaration and Address published in Washington Pa. 1809, you could not suppose, as you have done, that I "had my eye so fixed upon a few prominent principles, that I had not time to examine some doctrines I had before received as truth," &c. To have acted thus in a matter of such vast importance—of such sacred responsibility, would be highly censurable, indeed. This document, however, is still public property; and to it I can, and do appeal with pleasure, as an insuperable defence against all misrepresentations of the Reformation, for which we constantly and earnestly plead. From this it will appear, that not "a few prominent principles," but a complete scriptural reformation, is urged and defined; having for its specified object, "to inculcate and reduce to practice, that simple original form of Christianity, expressly exhibited on the sacred page; without attempting to inculcate any thing of human authority, of private opinion, or inventions of men, as having any place in the constitution, faith, or worship of the Christian church;—or any thing as matter of Christian faith or duty, for which there cannot be expressly produced a '*Thus saith the Lord*,' either in express terms, or by approved precedent." See the said Declaration, page 4. And now, after twenty-four year's opportunity afforded the public to examine the above document, and our practice upon it, we are happy to find none so hardened as to attempt to prove that the proposed reformation is objectionable; nor yet so much as one that has attempted to prove, that we have in any instance departed from it. Moreover, it will appear by the examination of said document, that, instead of bringing with us some doctrines that we had not time to examine, we brought no doctrines with us at all into the area of the proposed Reformation; but, instead of so doing, we assumed the proposition above

quoted, as our platform—our fixed dimensions, inclusive and exclusive. So much to prevent and correct mistakes.

I now proceed to notice the confessed subject of your sorrowful regret on my behalf. You kindly say: "I am sorry to find my old brother, who has so zealously and successfully plead for reformation on Bible facts alone, now attaching so much importance to his opinion of the sacrifice of Christ;—*so much*, that you believe it impossible, that any of our race can be saved without the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, as you have explained it; for this must be your meaning." Dear brother, when you speak of Bible facts, do you not consider the "sacrifice of the Lamb of God" the chief? and have you no opinion about it? and do you not attach much importance to it? even so much "that none of our race can be saved without it, as you have explained it? for this must be *your* meaning."—See p. 208.—"Had he not died, then the plan of infinite wisdom for the redemption of man, would have been prostrated; the prophecies respecting his death would have failed; his own predictions of his death and resurrection would have been nullified; and the world's last and best hope forever cut off." So be it, say I. And what have I said, more than this? I have only said, in the conclusion of *my* letter, "that, believing as I do, that it was not possible, that any one of our race could be saved without the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, I must hold every attempt to explain it away into a mere moral example, or display of love without regard to justice, as tending to subvert the basis of the divine government, and to rob the gospel of all that glorifies the wisdom and power, the justice and mercy of God in putting away sin, and in saving the sinner." It is not, then, the degree of importance that my opinion attaches to the death of Christ, either as it respects the glory of God, or the salvation of man, in which we differ; but about the express scriptural reasons of its vast importance. And here, dear brother, permit me to express, in my turn, my sincere regret, that having lifted up your voice for a pure scriptural reformation, predicated upon the Bible alone, you should ever have been led off that divine platform into the arena of sectarian controversies. But what is past cannot be recalled: and had you not anticipated me in the expression of your kind concern for my inconsistencies, you would, no doubt, think yourself justly entitled to return the compliment, having found me engaged in criticising N. W—. However, in this, I hope I have not transgressed the prescribed bounds; for while we are divinely prohibited from teaching as doctrines the commandments and opinions of men, we are commanded to contend earnestly for the faith formerly delivered to the saints: and this is all I have attempted, or intended, in the letter under consideration; namely, to state and maintain the Scripture account of the cause, nature, design, and effects of the death of Christ, as expressly declared in the Holy Scriptures, in opposition to the false and imposing statements of N. W—.

But before I proceed to notice your remarks on my humble efforts, I should give you credit for the honor you have done me, notwithstanding all my palpable deficiencies, in classing me with good men

in all ages; for you say—"Good men in all ages have done what you have done." For instance: "The Council of Nice denied salvation to all who rejected their unintelligible jargon—Luther and Calvin did the same in fact; and every sectarian establishment proceeds on the same principles." I thank you for the compliment; but cannot receive it, as you have explained it; for while I have no doubt but that good men in *all ages*, either implicitly or explicitly, ascribed their salvation to the blood of the Lamb; (See Rev. i. 5, 6, and v. 8—14.) yet I cannot admit that good men *in any age* denied salvation to all who rejected their unintelligible jargon.

But why all this preamble of controversial subtlety—this superfluity of polemic finesse? How does it at all apply either to the party or the subject? Is it the avowed principle of the "Old Reformer" to make any human opinion a term of communion, much less of salvation? or are the scripture declarations he has cited respecting the cause, nature, design and effects of the death of Christ, unintelligible jargon!!! We hope not. Why then this unmeaning, gratuitous preamble? Gentle reader, it has a meaning; it means to prepare you for what is to follow, by forewarning you of the character of the author and of his performance, which your courteous and faithful polemic guide is about to expose and condemn, that you may be the better prepared to hear with a prejudiced partiality, and so with him to concur, and enjoy the victory. But, dear brother, you will pardon me, if I have given you credit for more than you intended. I do not pretend to insist, that in these prefatory addresses you were actuated by evil motives; especially as you inform me that you write not as a controversialist, but as a lover of truth. Yet, after all, what use in these hard charges? Were they all true, they would neither prove nor disprove a single point that may be at issue between us. They can have no meaning nor leaning but to the prejudice both of mind and character. Wherefore, if we have happily made our escape from the arena of vain janglings, and strifes of words, into the sacred and peaceful enclosure of the holy Apostles and Prophets, let us leave behind us the weapons of that unprofitable and pernicious warfare,—imbibe the spirit, and adopt the phrase, of our divine instructors; that, practising and speaking the truth in love, we may be conformed to them in all things, and thus adorn our holy profession. But to proceed to your animadversions upon my letter.—

You seem to blame me for not admitting the whole of N. W's proposition respecting the sufferings of Christ; viz. that "in the sacrifice of Christ there was a display of love, not of wrath." The affirmative clause of this proposition I heartily admit; the negative I refuse; and to meet the argument adduced to support it, namely, that "if God has no pleasure in the death and sufferings of the wicked, he surely could have none in the sufferings of his Son," I quote Isaiah liii. 10. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief." To this quotation you take exception, as if it were not to be understood literally, or did not mean what it says; yet after a variety of attempts to establish your hypothesis, you come in the close of the investigation to concede all that the said text was quoted to prove; namely, that "for love to the world Jehovah chose his Son to be their Saviour. He inclined to humble him by being born of a woman; suffering the hatred and persecution of the world; enduring the

agonies of death; in being buried, and continuing three days under the power of death. He hath caused him to travail in pain, as a woman in parturition. Such were the sorrows of Immanuel on account of the sins of the world." This is conceding all, and more than was intended in the quotation; yes, and much more than the text alone would prove or was intended to convey; for, as appears from the immediate connexion, it is particularly restricted to his crucifixion. Nor does it appear from your appeal to the original that Jehovah was less efficient in the sufferings of his Son; for, according to it, he *inclined* to humble him; he *caused* him to travail in pain; yet, strange as it may appear, after your translation and comment, you tell us once and again, that "God had no direct nor indirect agency in the death of his Son." How can this be? Can a person be acquitted of any agency, direct or indirect, in an event which he inclined, and actually caused to come to pass, because he was not the actual and immediate efficient in its accomplishment? If, so, then David, and Joab his chief captain, had no hand, either direct or indirect, in the death of Uriah; because they neither killed him themselves, nor put it into the hearts of those that did it. Neither had God any hand, direct or indirect, in chastising and humbling his people by the agency of the Assyrian monarch, because he acted freely in doing so, without any respect to the divine intention; for he neither meant to do the thing that God intended, nor so much as thought of it; yet God expressly declares himself the author of the calamities which that tyrant inflicted, and that he was but the instrument in his hand; saying, "O, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation." See Isaiah x. 5, 6, &c. And here, let it be noted once for all, that this same principle of the divine government, most explicitly avowed and explained in the 10th chapter of Isaiah, will obviate all the supposed difficulties, and afford a key for the just and consistent interpretation of all the texts quoted in the first section of your letter, against the literal interpretation of Isaiah liii. 10. And not only so, but this same avowed principle of the divine government will also solve the apparent difficulty of admitting the literal meaning of certain passages of holy scripture which seem to ascribe the efficiency of moral evil to God; such as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, (Ex. iv. 21.)—the hearts of the Egyptians, (Ex. xiv. 7.)—blinding the eyes and hardening the hearts of the Jews to their destruction, (Isaiah vi. 10. John xii. 40)—deceiving the prophets, (Ez. xiv. 9)—deceiving the people, (Jer. iv. 10. Ez. xiv. 4, 5.)—giving them bad statutes and judgments by which they could not live, (Ez. xx. 25, 26.)—sending them strong delusions that they may believe a lie, that they all may be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness, (2 Thess. ii. 11.) The infliction of all these evils, which, in relation to the persons affected, we are wont to call moral evils, the Scriptures ascribe to God; as well as the infliction of all physical evils, (Amos iii. 6. Isai. xlv. 7.) and all on account of sin; for God sometimes punishes sin with sin. See Hosea viii. Rom. ii. 24, 26. 2 Thess. ii. 11. and this of all punishments is the most dreadful. What shall we, then, say to these things? Is there unrighteousness with God?" By no means; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man; but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Jas. i. 13, 14. Hence we see that God neither is, nor can be, the author of moral evil, inasmuch as he neither does nor can instill, suggest, or excite evil dispositions or desires, but only makes use of one sinner to bring about the punishment or destruction of another in this way, as in the case of David and Ahab. The former we are told the Lord moved to number Israel and Judah, because his anger was kindled against them. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. But we learn that he was provoked to do this by the agency of Satan. 1 Chron. xxi. 1. In the case of the latter, we have the whole of the divine procedure narrated in the same page. See 1 Kings xxii. 16—23. I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I

will persuade him. And the Lord said to him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; go forth, and do so. Now, therefore, behold the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." Now this explains the whole mystery of the divine management in the use of evil agents for accomplishing the just and holy purposes of his moral government: and thus is verified that saying, "The Lord has made all for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." Prov. xvi. 4. The deceived and the deceiver are his. Job xii. 16. He frequently makes use of the one to punish the other: and whenever a people through wickedness are ripe for an evil day, the Lord has in readiness wicked agents to inflict the deserved punishment; and, like the Assyrian monarch, and the lying spirit, only wait for permission. Nor can we think so meanly of the Governor of the Universe, as to suppose than any can act, or that any thing can be done under his government, without his permission; much less that he should permit any thing to be done against his will, whose sole prerogative it is to do whatsoever pleases him in the armies of heaven, and amongst the inhabitants of the earth; especially, and least of all, that any thing should have befallen his beloved Son but according to his determinate counsel and previous approbation. "For of a truth, against his holy Son Jesus, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, to do whatsoever his hand and his counsel determined before to be done. See Acts iv. 27, 28.

These things duly considered, what comes of your few appalling questions? —of your allegation against my quotations, as if meant to prove that God himself killed his Son? Have I any where said so?—except in quoting the words of Zech. xiii. 7. which immediately follow?—"Awake, O sword! against my Shepherd," &c. But do you not know that wicked men are the Lord's sword? Psal. xvii. 13. "Arise, O Lord! deliver my soul from the wicked, which is thy sword." This is in complete accordance with the key furnished in Isai. x. 5, 6. &c. "O, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger," &c. Your objection to the above quotation as inapplicable, because it is said, "I will turn my hand on the little ones," is of no force; for if this clause means the subsequent persecutions of the disciples by the same wicked hands that crucified their Master, it only goes to show that it was a part of the divine plan, that the disciple should be as his Master, and that these same wicked who were the Lord's hand (Psal. xvii. 14.) in inflicting punishment upon his beloved Son, should be permitted to afflict his followers, though not for the same purpose on God's part, yet with the same disposition on theirs.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

The Infidel's Creed.

Mr. Campbell,

YOU have had a *hard scuffle* with the various sects, for nearly ten years past, about their different creeds, opinions, and traditions. As the war of creeds has ceased, and peace has been proclaimed in favor of the Bible, I shall send you a short creed, which, for the sake of distinction, I shall call the *Infidel's Creed.* For you must know that we have a short summary of what we believe and teach.

Article 1. I believe that there is no God, but that matter is God, and God is matter; and that it is no matter whether there is any God or not.

Article 2. I believe also, that the world was not made; that the world made itself; that it had no beginning; that it will last forever, world without end.

Article 3. I believe that man is a beast; that the soul is the body and the body is the soul; and that after death there is neither soul nor body.

Article 4. I believe that all sectarianism is religion, and all religion is sectarianism; and that there is no religion except sectarianism. Amen.

Article 5. I believe not in Moses; I believe in the Egyptian and Chaldean philosophy.

Article 6. I believe not in the New Testament; I believe in all creeds, systems, and heresies.

Article 7. I believe not in the Bible; I believe in traditions, oral and written. I believe not in revelation; I believe the Talmud; I believe the Koran.

Article 8. I believe not in Christ; I believe in Socrates, Confucius, in Sanchoniathan, and in Mahomet—in Thomas Paine and Lord Bolingbroke.

Article 9. I believe in all unreasonableness—in all unrighteousness and wickedness—in all religion and in no religion. In short, I believe in *all unbelief.* Amen!

A BELIEVER IN ALL UNBELIEF.

The Believer's Creed.

Article 1. I believe all that is written in the five books of Moses, all that is written in the Prophets and the Psalms.

Article 2. I believe in, and obey the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

A CHRISTIAN.

Religious Anecdotes of dying Professors.

GROTIUS.

Grotius possessed the brightest genius ever recorded of a youth in the learned world; yet, after all his attainments, reputation, and labor in the cause of learning, he was constrained at last to cry out, "Ah! I have consumed my life in a laborious doing of nothing! I would give all my learning for the plain integrity of John Urick." This John Urick was a religious poor man, who spent eight hours of the day in prayer, eight in hard labor, and eight in meals, sleep, and recreation.

SALMASIUS.

When Salmasius, who was one of the most consummate scholars of his time, the President of the University of Italy, and the learned antagonist of the immortal John Milton, drew near the close of his life, he exclaimed bitterly against himself. "Oh!" said he, "I have lost a world of time!—time, the most precious thing in the world! whereof had I but one year more, it should be spent in reading David's Psalms and Paul's Epistles! Oh! mind the world less, and God more!"

DOCTOR SAMUEL JOHNSON.

Doctor Samuel Johnson, the author of the Dictionary, was grievously haunted with the fear of death *all* his life. Just before he died, he said to a friend, "The approach of death is very dreadful. I am afraid to think on that which I cannot avoid. I never had a moment in which death was not terrible to me." On his dying bed he exhorted Sir Joshua Reynolds to read the Bible, and to keep holy the Sabbath day.

THE IMMORTAL PHILOSOPHER, JOHN LOCKE.

That far-famed and greatly renowned Christian philosopher, John Locke, the author of Religious Toleration in 1689, the ornament of his country and of humanity itself, spent the last fourteen or fifteen years of his great and useful life in reading scarcely any other book except the sacred Scriptures. The day before he died, (so earnest was he for the comfort of his friends and the diffusion of Christian knowledge among them,) he exhorted all about him to read the Holy Scriptures, exalting the love which God showed to man in justifying him by faith in Jesus Christ, and returning him thanks for having called him to the knowledge of that divine Saviour. To a person who asked him which was the *shortest* and *surest way* for a young gentleman to attain to the true knowledge of the Christian religion, in the full and just extent of it, he replied, "Let him study the Holy Scriptures, *especially the New Testament.* Therein are contained the words of eternal life. It hath God for its author—salvation for its end—and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter."—Locke was a friend to God and man. Though dead, he still recommends to us, and to all future generations, to read the Scriptures. He walked with God. J. C.

The Death and Testimony of Spencer Clack.

THE following letter, if genuine, as we have much reason to think it is, presents another proof that most men die as they live; and it also proves that the deceased was *sincere* in his opposition to reformation. It proves no more than *sincerity.* And that he was sincerely opposed to reformation, in the present import of that word, we do not doubt; for before he had ever carefully read or heard our sentiments, he said he would oppose us, and on my second visit to Kentucky came to one of my places of speaking in Fayette county for that purpose. But for what purpose is this letter now going the rounds in all the Baptist periodicals? Do they intend to make his sincerity a test of his views, or ours? This his martyrdom could not do, much less his dictations to a brother amanuensis, who may or may not have solicited him to give such testimony in favor of the mission to which he was devoted, and against the reformation, to which he was as much opposed as Mr. Clack. Are the scribes of the Baptists so hard put to it as to use such weapons in defence of their views? Will they admit such a testimony to be an argument for their cause? Then they must plead that Christ was not a partaker of the flesh of the Virgin Mary:

for Joan of Kent, a very sincere and pious Protestant, was burned at the stake, by order of Cranmer, in attestation of the sincerity of her opinion that he was not; assigning as a reason, that "the Virgin's flesh being sinful, he could not partake of it." Will her dying testimony, much stronger than that of Mr. Clack, prove that she was right and Cranmer wrong? Or will the martyrdom of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, prove that the Church of England and infant baptism are divine institutions, because they died sincerely in this opinion? While martyrdom and the dying testimony of men may prove a fact, no man of sense will admit that either is any proof whatever of the truth of an opinion.

But that our readers may have this new argument in all its force, we shall give it to them as we find it in the Vermont Telegraph, which is about the sixth or seventh edition of it that we have seen:—

PALMYRA, Marion county, Mo. June 4, 1833.

Dear Brother Going—I am now dying. Since my last communication to you, I have had much affliction in my family;—I want you should pay up my full salary for the year out, else my family must suffer. My trust is in the Lord: he is able to strengthen me and uphold me in my dying hour. "Don't give up the ship." You are engaged in a good cause. You will meet with opposition, —fear not. I have honestly, faithfully and conscientiously defended the cause, —not with the object of making money, for I have sustained pecuniary losses; but for the glory of God and of his cause. Say to all the Missionaries to be faithful, and bear hardships as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth from all sin. The Mission cause is the cause of God. The Lord loveth a cheerful giver; but he that soweth sparingly, shall reap sparingly.

My affectionate regards to the churches at Bloomfield, Bardstown, and Little Union. I am going home to meet brother Norris, and the rest of the brethren. Beware of Campbellism. I have been charged with being a Campbellite:—it is without any cause in truth, for I consider it a dangerous heresy.

Tell brother Vardeman I want him to preach my funeral sermon in Palmyra, and expose Campbellism. I want this letter published as my dying testimony to the truth. This letter is made up of scraps. I am dying:—into the hands of God I resign my spirit. SPENCER CLACK."

Yes, brother Vardeman can "expose Campbellism," and tell how sincere he and Spencer Clack have been in going to Missouri, and in trying to get up a paper to expose it, of which our deceased friend was to have been Editor. All this evidence will be as irresistible as Peter Edwards' on infant baptism, who sincerely repented of his baptistical errors, and died sound in the faith that infant baptism was a divine institution.

Were we disposed to catch at these incidents, and to draw arguments from the whole history of matters and things in connexion with all the Missouri movements, what very different conclusions could we draw, and how much stronger testimony in favor of the Reformation could we find in those incidents and movements, than the sincerity of our deceased friend, or of his living panegyrists. But this would be unworthy of so good a cause, and therefore we are not allowed to use them.

But these erudite editors are the best judges of the calibre of the intellect of their readers; and if they think such arguments are the

most convincing to them, we have no reason to envy them, nor to complain: for no man who believes the Christian religion upon such evidence as they offer for orthodoxy, is worthy to be enrolled in the ranks of reformation.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

CARLOWSVILLE, Ala. July 9, 1833.

IT is now 10 o'clock, A. M. The heavens are overspread with portentous clouds. I have been shut up in my studying room over your preface to the four gospels. To-morrow I am called to attend at a congregation over which I have presided 15 months, to show cause why sentence of death should not be pronounced against me, seeing that I have embraced *the ancient order of things*, contrary to the custom of the clergy. My dear brother, if heaven be not the ultimatum of those who contend for this order, no where else can an equivalent be found.

You are charged with every thing which falsehood can instigate. You are said to be Arius' friend, Arminius', &c.—but above all, to deny the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the sinner in conversion; teach regeneration in water; an enemy to textuaries; the Bible's sufficiency; special call, (O how this hurts!!) your salary for mental labor is reported to be worth 50 or 60,000 dollars per annum, &c. &c. &c.

I am stipulating with an editor who publishes a paper at Cahawba, Dallas county, to publish your essays on the Holy Spirit—Call—Bishop's Office—Missionary Schemes—on Election, &c. I know that your sentiments are public property.

Every denomination here is on the alert. If a Hewitt or Smith, &c. would consent to spend one or more years in this section, my home should be his. Do write to some of them on this subject.

In hope of that good reward above, yours,

JAMES A. BUTLER.

N. B. The nature of my trial to-morrow, is, whether my bishopric shall not be taken away and given to another. J. A. B.

CARLOWSVILLE, July 10, 1833.

Dear brother—ON Saturday last the congregation over which I presided, and at which my membership was, took up my case in the following manner:

"Brother Butler, you are charged with preaching Campbellism, which we believe to be a great digression from the old orthodox way."

I asked the brethren if they had acquainted themselves with Campbell's views.

Ans. "No. But you (replied they) do not preach as formerly."

I replied I did not, but was prepared to show the reasons why.

They responded that they "were not able to argue the points with me."

I replied that they could call a conference of the preaching brethren, before whom I would delight to appear.

"No, No."

They asked me to give my views on the Holy Spirit's office.

I did so by reading the testimonies of God.

"Well," responded an old deacon, "that is my belief;" but told the church, with a deep groan, [profound logic here!] that I had strayed.

I told the congregation that I had truly embraced Campbell's views.

They replied, "That is enough."

The Moderator put this question: "You, brethren, have heard brother Butler. Those who oppose *him*, rise."

None rose. I knew that a part would be forced to vote against me. I thought it most expedient to withdraw. Did so. Preached the next day (Isa. ii.) to an over-crowded house. Begged for stated privileges of the house. Two only opposed. But refused acceptance unless they were unanimous. Other houses were proposed for my accommodation, one of which I accepted. Brother Campbell, do the 11th and 17th chapters of Revelation, and 2 Thess. ii. refer to the present time? O Lord, have compassion on Zion!

My dear sir, were I to depict in a regularly written essay, the present aspect of affairs here, among those denominated religious, your soul would mourn. I do pray that God may hover over me, and especially his good begun cause.

In hope of immortality,

J. A. BUTLER.

☞Before God, they have not a written specification against me, and they declared they had not aught against my religious character, other than my faith. J. A. B.

[The more good you do, the more you will be reproached. The more slander, obloquy, and reproach, the better for the cause; and the more suffering, the more happiness for the righteous. "Rejoice and exult; for great is your reward in heaven, if you suffer for *righteousness' sake.*" No pity for the man who is commanded to rejoice and exult in his persecutions and reproaches. The more the better for the truth and them who love it!]——*Ed*

Howard, Centre county, Pa. June 29, 1833.

I HAVE been informed that the Methodists and Presbyterians, prior to the exhibition of the ancient gospel in this vicinity, were continually trying to preach down each other's opinions. While they were thus engaged the ancient gospel broke out among them; and before they had time to fix on a plan, more than *one hundred* persons had obeyed Jesus Christ, to the great detriment of the contending parties. They began to look around them, and cry out, 'Our craft is in danger! These have come hither also who turn the world upside down!' The contending parties have now united their efforts to retard the progress of the reformation by all the usual means they make use of.

NATHAN I. MITCHELL.

Doneraile, Ky. July 18, 1833.

THE good cause is prospering finely with us. The brethren meet often, sometimes every day for several days in succession, and they have happy times and joyful seasons, whilst hundreds are bowing their necks to the yoke of our King. W. Z. THOMSON.

Buffalo, N. Y. June 28th, 1833.

THE subject of *reformation* seems to be attracting increased attention here; and could we have the assistance of some one of our talented brethren, who labor in the word, there cannot be a doubt but an abundant harvest might be gathered in. A number of individuals belonging to the different sects now stand ready to join a New Testament church, as soon as such a church can be regularly organized; but, like persons exposed on a tempestuous ocean, having but a frail plank to preserve them from the foaming abyss, they are unwilling to yield up their feeble support till they can grasp the protecting barge that rides majestically at a distance. We have some hope that brothers Moss and Hayden, who we understand will pass through this city on their way east, will stop here a short time and assist us in forming a church.

M. G. LEWIS.

Streetsborough, O. July 12, 1833.

Dear Sir—WE are all well, as indeed it is a time of general health in our country. Harvest having commenced, I of course am engaged as other men are. Brother Moss and I have immersed *fifty-six* since we came home, and

the churches where we have spent most time are generally doing well. I wish that Mr. Powell's "*soldier's of real hardihood*" would come on, and he would find, I think, that in the vicinity of Aurora a church of 100 members might be gathered; but it would be to the apostolic faith, as we have already more than half that number, and a prospect of regular increase; as, indeed, it has been so ever since we commenced here—three years ago. Sister W. A. Lathrop writes good news from Onondaga and Cayuga counties, N. Y. In her letter of April 24th she tells me that a variety of circumstances have contributed to the furtherance of the gospel there. The Methodist society, in one case, at her request readily gave the liberty of their house, and people were very willing to hear. Three Baptist preachers, viz. Bartlett, Tomson, and Lowel, have taken a bold stand. They have many Macedonian calls; and what pleases me much, is, they are not wanting hearts to regard the entreaties of the people. Frequent accessions, either from the Baptists, (many of whom are candid and willing to receive truth,) or by immersion. Brother Frost, of Riga, Monroe county, N. Y. was here in May. He informs us that three or four as able men as were in the Free Will Baptist Conference, Gennessee county, have come fully into the reformation; one was excluded by the Conference, and two obtained letters of dismission. Another was expected to come out soon. They are beginning in the best way there; having a good proportion of able men at the outset, churches composed of the flower of the flocks, and of course possessing an influence that cannot be gainsayed, it must give the cause an impetus, which, with prudence and perseverance, will render it triumphant ere long.

WM. HAYDEN.

NASHVILLE, Tenn. July 5, 1833.

I HAVE had the pleasure of enjoying once more the society of my old friends here. During my visit, fourteen persons have obeyed the gospel—and among them, many most valuable and excellent persons.

The brethren are standing fast in one faith, and are moving on in harmony and affection. Their number has been gradually increased, and that too by the addition of persons who do honor to the cause.

P. S. FALL.

WHITE HILL, Williamson county, Tenn. 4uly 5, 1833.

I WILL now give a word of *good* news. The good cause of *reform* is still progressing very finely in this neighborhood. Thirteen were added to the congregation at Berea last Lord's day; (eleven of whom I immersed on that day;) making in all about 30 added to this church during the first half of this year. Joy, love, and peace, abound in the little family here; thanks and honor be unto the Lord! I hope, my brother, you will remember *us* when you bow before your heavenly Father.

JOSHUA K. SPEER.

COLUMBIA, Tenn. July 29, 1833.

I WAS at a meeting 12 miles east of Columbia, in this county, of a congregation under the care of Joshua K. Speer. Eight persons came forward on Saturday, and three yesterday, and confessed that *Jesus* was Lord by submitting to his government. Two of the number were, an old man and his wife, that had been, as I was informed, Presbyterians for a number of years. They looked to be about eighty years old.

T. S. ALDERSON.

CHARLESTOWN, Va. August 2, 1833.

THE Cholera has been in this place about four weeks;—there have been, say 25 deaths, in the country. In some neighborhoods it has been worse, in proportion to the population, than here. There have been no new cases for four or five days. The good work of the Lord is progressing, in every part of this

county and state. Next Lord's day, if able, I am to immerse six who have professed their faith in Christ. Several others are expected. O that sinners may continue to bow to the Lamb, and be saved!

M. COLE.

Mt. Sterling, Ky. August 9, 1833.

BROTHRR Smith has immersed near two hundred and seventy within the bounds of ten miles square, and not exceeding seven miles from this place. May the Good Lord continue to prosper his cause!

E. C. PAYNE.

Pendleton County, Ky. August 8, 1833.

I VISITED the brethren at Ketontown, near Claysville, last Saturday and Lord's day. I addressed the assembly on Saturday at three o'clock, from Galatians, 4th chapter. Five confessed the Lord, and were immersed for the remission of sins. On Lord's day at 11 o'clock, I spoke from Titus, 3d chapter, and brother John Roberts followed from John, 1st chapter. Five more confessed and were baptized. The prospects of many more soon, are quite flattering. There was a large and attentive concourse each day.

At Williamstown, Grant county, Ky. it seems that almost every body will soon confess the Lord. Within a few weeks, (say 9 or 10.) near 100 have joined themselves to the good cause. Many other neighborhoods and towns are filled with joy and gladness, by reason of the reformation of sinners; while others seem to be characterized by a Laodicean spirit, and many of the children of Jezebel, going to and fro, cast more ice into the already frozen chambers of sectarianism. The truth, however, is mighty; and will, I believe, ultimately prevail.

S. K. MILTON.

Rochester, N. Y. July 6, 1833.

MANY public speakers have recently come over to help us. I have just returned from a short visit in Canada, opposite Rochester. I attended a meeting of about 500. About fifty have, within a few weeks, embraced the truth in the love of it, and have been "baptized for the remission of sins."

W. A. SCRANTON.

Monroe County, Mo. June 29, 1833.

Fifteen or eighteen months since, I removed to this county and commenced proclaiming the gospel of Christ. The ears of the people were soon open to receive it. Brother B. L. Abernethev preached eight or ten times in this county twelve months ago, the effect of which is yet to be seen. He and myself constituted two churches; and at that time, and during last summer, I baptized between twenty-five and thirty. This spring we planted a church in Paris. It commenced with six members—some have been added almost every meeting since. Last Lord's day, brother M'Bride preached and gave an opportunity to confess the Lord; four made the good confession, and were by him baptized immediately. I have baptized six in this church;—the present number is about twenty-five. On yesterday, brother M. Wills preached; one made the good confession, and will be baptized to-day—three others joined by commendation. The prospects here are truly good. Brother Haden preached three days to one of the churches first named, including last Lord's day; three made confession, and were baptized by him. Several more were added to the church, and the prospects are very good in that church and neighborhood. Brother M'Bride preached in Florida last Wednesday, planted a church, and baptized three or four. These four churches in this county, have been planted on the word of God, and are marching from Babylon to Jerusalem.

THOMAS THOMPSON.

[Much interesting information on the progress of reform has been crowded out of this number.]——*Ed.*

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number IX.——Volume IV.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. September, 1833.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

WE will now briefly examine that ever-memorable prediction delivered upon the Mount of Olives, relative to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the second coming of the Son of Man. Our blundering blind guides have long been foundered on this prediction, in their gigantic strides to make it apply to the close of time and the destruction of Jerusalem. I have no doubt on my mind, but, on the Jewish and Gentile dispensations, the whole prophecy has had, and will have, its complete accomplishment. O! the fatal error of transferring every thing within the lids of the Bible, in which there is any alarm, to the general judgment!

The first part of the prediction was relative to the dreadful calamities which were to attend the close of the Jewish dispensation, or the typical gospel. The latter part portrays, in strong metaphorical language, the destiny of a dispensation, properly and truly the antitype of the former. Some of the remarks of the Master may properly be considered general, or relative to both dispensations—the one typical, the other typified—the one developing in type the character and fate of the other. At the time of this prediction the Jewish church had become extremely corrupt and self-righteous. Reader, are you prepared to show how far the past exceeded the present in these very things? The past, just before its downfall, had built the most magnificent house for worship on earth. Like the mistakes of the present, they were going to heaven by show and parade, tithe-paying, long praying, and splendid temples; instead of holy, simple, and un-

ostentatious devotion, deeds of charity and the like. The disciples, fond of showing the meek and lowly Saviour the splendid superstructure, were astonished to hear its fate foretold: "See ye not these things? Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." The pompous ceremonies, the splendid buildings in which men now-a-days profess to worship him who had not where to lay his head, will soon share a similar fate.

"And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" [conclusion of this state.] The term *world*, in this very passage, taken in the common acceptation, has been the source of much blundering. If applied to the dispensation, a difficulty is at once removed. How exactly was the fate of the temple foretold! Demolished to its very foundation. How exactly the fate of the Jewish nation! "For there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people." The sack of Jerusalem, the distress of the Jewish nation at the time of its overthrow, has no parallel on earth. "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." How strongly is the Jewish nation, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, preaching, in irreristible language, the truth of the Christian religion! Facts are stronger than argument. How exactly have the words of the Messiah been fulfilled! "Thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee." What a picture! We cite to the prophecies which have had an accomplishment, to strengthen the believer's faith that those in the future will as exactly come to pass as that Jerusalem was encompassed by a trench and destroyed by a Roman army, its Temple razed to its foundation, and the Jews slain and scattered among the nations.

I admit there is a difficulty of no small moment presents itself in the prediction delivered on the Mount—that of drawing a separating line between those relative to the Jewish and Gentile churches. But those of a general nature are applicable to either dispensation, had an accomplishment first on the Jew, will have a second on the Gentile. Those respecting false Christs are not less applicable to the present times, than they were to the age when the Messiah made his first advent into the world. Does it need proof that there are false Christs in the world, in the face of the endless diversities in the Christian religion? The different Christs, Saviours, or salvations, plans of getting to heaven, &c. are almost as different as the differing sects, crying, "Lo! here is Christ!" The signs which preceded the dissolution of the former dispensation, will doubtless precede the dissolution of the present. And just as sure as the typical dispensation was dissolved, fell, smitten by the hand of Omnipotence; so will the typified fall: for the same unchanging God yet holds the destiny of

nations, empires, or dispensations in his hand. We may expect false teachers and false prophets to arise and "deceive many." "And ye shall hear of wars, and rumors of wars," &c. "For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places," &c. "And ye shall be hated of all nations for my *name sake*."

At this very time are not all these forerunners visible? What name is more persecuted, looked at with more suspicion, than the name *Christian?** To say nothing about the odium cast upon it by the nations of the world, the man who wears this *name*, and only *this*, is treated with less brotherly love, less forbearance, sooner suspected for unsoundness in the faith, than for any other name or appellative distinction or badge known or heard of in christendom, and despised and rejected by those who profess the religion of Christ! What time when the rumor of war was ever so universal? scarcely a government but is giving indications of internal convulsion, tottering on its foundation, or assuming a posture of defence against invasion. Who can view these things without dreading what to-morrow may bring to pass—without a painful solicitude about the future, about the fate of nations, the fate of millions who are to witness, aye, more than witness, "a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation!" Wo unto Europe, the seat of Antichrist! There are the witnesses to be slain—there the theatre on which is to be fought "the battle of that great day of God Almighty"—there the winepress to be trodden. By pestilence and war, by famine and flame "will the Lord plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be many."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Sherlock on Divine Providence.

[*Concluded*]

3dly. LET us now consider what difference there is between God's absolute government of all events, and necessity and fate; for many men are very apt to confound these two. If no good or evil befall any man, but what God orders and appoints for them, this they think sounds like fate and destiny—that every man's fortune is written upon his forehead—and that it is impossible for any man, by all his care, and industry, and prudence, to make his condition better than what God has decreed it to be in the irreversible rolls of fate. And yet an unrelenting, immutable fate is so irreconcilable with the liberty of human actions, with the nature of good and evil, of rewards and punishments, that if we admit of it, there is an end of all religion, of all virtuous endeavors, of all great and generous attempts: it is to no purpose to pray to God, or to trust in him, or to resist temptations, or

*Perhaps I should except a name or two. The Shakers are going down to oblivion—the Mormons rising in their stead, no less deceivers—no less deceived—false prophets—false Christs—"signs of the times!"

to be diligent in our business, or prudent and circumspect in our actions; for what will be, will be: or if any means be to be used, that is no matter of our choice or care; but we shall do it as necessarily and mechanically as a watch moves and points to the hour of the day; for fate has, by the same necessity, determined the means and the end, and we can do no more nor less than fate has determined.

I shall now trouble you with an account of the various opinions of the ancient philosophers about fate, none of whom ever dreamed of such a terrible fate as some Christians have fancied, which reaches not only to this world, but to all eternity. What I have already discoursed is sufficient to vindicate the doctrine of Providence from the least imputation of necessity and fate.

For, 1st. Though God overrules the actions of men, to do what he himself thinks fit to be done, yet he lays no necessity upon human actions: men will and choose freely, pursue their own interests and inclinations, just as they would do if there were no Providence to govern them; and while men act freely, it is certain there can be no absolute fate. God, indeed, as you have already heard, sometimes hinders them from executing their wicked purposes, and permits them to do no more hurt than what he can direct to wise ends; but no man is wicked, or does wickedly, by necessity and fate. Though he may be restrained from doing so much wickedness as he would, yet all the wickedness he commits is his own free choice, even when it serves such ends as he never thought of; and therefore he is, and acts like a free agent, notwithstanding the government of Providence.

2dly. Though God determines all events, all the good and evil that shall happen to men or nations, yet it is no more nor no other than what they themselves have deserved; and therefore they are under no other fate than what they themselves bring upon themselves by the good or bad use of their own liberty; that is, they are under no other fate than to be rewarded when they do well, and to be punished when they do ill: but this is the justice of Providence, not the necessity of fate. Those who do ill, and deserve ill, and suffer ill, might have done well, and have made themselves the favorites of Providence, and therefore are under no greater necessity of suffering ill, than they were of doing ill. The reason why God keeps all events in his own hands, is not because he has absolutely determined the fates of all men, but that he may govern the world wisely and justly, and reward and punish men according to their deserts, as far as the reasons of Providence require in this world. Now while the liberty of human actions is secured, and the events of Providence are not the execution of fatal, absolute, and unconditional decrees, but acts of government in the wise administration of justice, and dispensing rewards and punishments,—how absolute soever God's government be of all events, it is not necessity and fate, but a wise, and just, and absolute government. This, indeed, is what some of the wisest heathens called fate, and all that they meant by the name of fate, that God had fixed it by an irreversible decree, that good men should be rewarded and the wicked punished; and thus far we must all allow fate; and Providence

is only the minister and executioner of these fatal decrees; and to that end God keeps the government of all events in his own hands. Now whether we say that God determines what good or evil shall befall men at the very time when they deserve it, or that foreseeing what good or evil they will do, and what they will deserve, did beforehand determine what good or evil should befall them,—this makes no alteration at all in the state of the question; for if all the good or evil that befalls men, have respect to their deserts, this is not fate, but a just and righteous judgment.

In a word, God's government of all events is indeed so absolute and uncontrolable, that no good or evil can befall any man, but what God pleases, what he orders and appoints for him; and this is necessary to the good government of the world and the care of all his creatures. But then God orders no good or evil to befall any men, but what they deserve, and what the wise ends of his Providence require; and this is not fate, but a wise and just government of the world.

4. That the exercise of a particular Providence consists in the government of all events.

I have often wondered at those philosophers who acknowledged a Providence, but would not acknowledge God's particular care of all his creatures. Some confined his Providence to the heavens, but would not extend it to this lower world; and yet this world needs a Providence as much, and a great deal more, as being a scene of change and corruption, of furious lusts and passions, which need the restraints and government of Providence: no creatures need God's care more than the inhabitants of this earth; and if he take care of any of his creatures, one would think he should take most care of them who need it most.

Others, who would allow that the Providence of God reached this lower world, yet confined God's care to the several kinds and species, but would not extend it to every individual; as if God took care of logical terms, of genus and species, but took no care of his own creatures, which are all individuals; or as if God could take care of all his creatures, without taking care of any particular creature; i. e. that he could take care of all his creatures, without taking care of any one of them.

Thus they would allow God to take care of the great affairs of kingdoms and commonwealths, but to have no regard to particular men or families, unless they made a great figure in the world; as if kingdoms and commonwealths were not made up of particular men and particular families; or that God could take care of the whole, without taking care of every part; or as if there were any other reason for taking care of the whole, but to take care of those particulars who make the whole. To talk of a general Providence, without God's care and government of every particular creature, is manifestly unreasonable and absurd; for whatever reasons oblige us to own a Providence, oblige us to own a particular Providence.

If creation be a reason why God should preserve and take care of what he has made, this is a reason why he should take care of every

creature, because there is no creature but what he made; and if the whole world consist of particulars, it must be taken care of in the care of particulars; for if all particulars perish, as they may do if no care be taken to preserve them, the whole must perish.

And there is the same reason for the government of mankind; for the whole is governed in the government of the parts; and mankind cannot be well governed, without the wise government of every particular man.

I am sure that the objections against a particular Providence are very foolish. Some think it too much trouble to God to take care of every particular; as if it were more trouble to him to take care of them, than it was to make them; or as if God had made more creatures than he could take care of; as if an infinite mind and omnipotent power were as much disturbed and tired with various and perpetual cares, as we are. Others think it below the greatness and majesty of God, to take cognizance of every mean and contemptible creature, or of every private man; as if it were more below God to take care of such creatures, than it is to make them; as if numbers made creatures considerable to God; that though one man is below God's care, yet a kingdom is worthy of his care and notice; when the whole world to God is but "as the drop of the bucket, and the small dust of the balance."

Now it is certain there can be no particular Providence, without God's government of all events; for if any good or evil happen to any man without God's order and appointment, that is not Providence, whatever other name you will give it: so that if God does take a particular care of all his creatures, this is a demonstration that he has the absolute government of all events; for without it he cannot take care of them: and if God have the government of all events, as the Scripture assures us he has, this confirms us in the belief of a particular Providence; for if all the good or evil that happens to every particular man, be appointed by God, that is proof enough that God takes care of every particular man. God's government of all particular events, and his care of all individuals, include each other in their very natures. The care of particular creatures consists in the government of all particular events; and the government of all events is the exercise of a particular Providence, as our Saviour represents it, Matt. x. 29, 30, 31. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear ye not, therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows." Where God's particular Providence over all his creatures is expressed by his particular care of all events, which extends even to the life of a sparrow, and to the hairs of our heads.

Thus much is certain, that without this belief, that God takes a particular care of all his creatures in the government of all events that can happen to them, there is no reason or pretence for most of the particular duties of religious worship. For most of the acts of worship consider God not merely as a universal cause, (could we form

any notion of a general Providence without any care of particular creatures or particular events,) but as our particular patron, protector, and preserver.

To fear God, and to stand in awe of his justice; to trust and depend on him in all conditions; to submit patiently to his will under all afflictions; to pray to him for the supply of our wants, for the relief of our sufferings, for protection and defence; to love and praise him for the blessings we enjoy, for peace and plenty, and health, for friends and benefactors, and all prosperous successes: I say, these are not the acts of reasonable men, unless we believe that God has the supreme disposal of all events, and takes a particular care of us. For if any good or evil can befall us without God's particular order and appointment, we have no reason to trust in God, who does not always take care of us; we have no reason to bear our sufferings patiently at God's hands, and in submission to his will; for we know not whether our sufferings be God's will or not: we have no reason to love and praise God for every blessing and deliverance we receive, because we know not whether it came from God; and it is to no purpose to pray to God for particular blessings, if he does not concern himself in particular events. But if we believe that God takes a particular care of us all, and that no good or evil happens to us but as he pleases, all these acts of religious worship are both reasonable, necessary, and just.

BETHANY, *Brooke County, Va.*

To Barton W. Stone.

Respected Brother,

IN my strictures upon your notice of my remarks on N. W's book on the atonement, published in the preceding number, which I intended as a reply to the first, second, third, and fourth items of your letter—my intention was to meet your objections, and obviate your supposed difficulties, not by a formal reply to each of them; but by adducing certain revealed principles of the divine government which go to obviate them all; hoping that I have succeeded to the satisfaction of all concerned, I now proceed to what remains.

In your 5th item, elicited by my quotation of Heb. ix. 22. and x. 4. you grant "that the blood of Christ does effect the remission of sin, is an undoubted truth. But *how?* is the question." I answer, By its redeeming efficacy. Rev. v. 9. "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." "Forasmuch as you know that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. You ask again, "Does the blood of Christ remove legal obstructions, existing between the forgiveness of God and the guilty?" I answer, Yes. "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; as it is written, Cursed is every one that

hangeth on a tree." Gal. iii. 13. The curse of the law, justly denounced against every one that continued not in all things written in the book of the law to do them, was a legal obstruction to the enjoyment of the divine forgiveness, till it was taken out of the way; but this the death of Christ has accomplished; for "he has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" and is, therefore, become the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes in him, whether Jew or Greek; for all the world is guilty before God; consequently there is but one way of justification, or acquittal for any; that is, by faith in his blood. "Justified by faith in his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." See Rom. v. 8, 9. with Heb. ix. 26. Rom. x. 4. and iii. 19—31. But you deny that sin is a legal obstruction to the enjoyment of the divine forgiveness, because that sinners are the only subjects of forgiveness. According to this, sinners have nothing to fear; for forgiveness is an essential attribute of divinity, "an eternal perfection of the divine nature," and therefore must necessarily be exercised; and sinners being the only qualified subjects, it can be exercised upon none else; consequently, sinners have nothing to fear; no, not one of them; for God is no respecter of persons—there is no partiality with him; also, the greater the sinner, the greater the forgiveness; and, of course, the greater the glory of the forgiver; for surely if the forgiveness of a small injury, of a small debt, be a display of kindness, of generosity, of liberality, of compassion, or of any perfection, the forgiveness of one ten thousand times greater must be a display of that perfection, greater in the exact proportion of 10,000 to 1. For we know both by reason and experience that the gratification and glory of any perfection is in exact proportion to the exercise and display of it. Yet, after all, you seem to grant that there may be a legal obstruction. "Not, indeed, the truth of God's word," but his justice may stand in the way of forgiveness, and that not on account of the intrinsic evil and illegality of sin, but merely on account of the disposition of the sinner; for you say, "If the subject be an impenitent sinner, every perfection in God, as well as justice, would oppose his forgiveness." Consequently, if penitent, no perfection in God would oppose his forgiveness; neither wisdom, goodness, justice, truth, nor holiness. Though we learn from his holy word, that all these glorious attributes are opposed to sin, and that three of them, especially, are glorified in the punishment of it: namely, justice, truth, and holiness; and wisdom in the invention of the deliverance—"I have found a ransom." Hence Christ crucified is styled the wisdom, as well as the power of God to salvation, to every one that believes. Now if, as you say, nothing on the part of God stands in the way of the forgiveness of the penitent sinner, what is the use of the gospel dispensation—of the Christian religion? Were there no penitents, no forgiveness for the 4000 years previous to the gospel? And if there were, what was wanting either to the glory of God or to the salvation of sinners? What need of the gospel—that is, of Christ, and him crucified? for this was Paul's gospel.

But to return to your second and third answers under consideration; I would ask, have the justice and truth of God nothing to do directly and immediately with the transgression of his law, irrespective of the after-thought, or postfactum disposition of the transgressor? Is not his authority rejected, his justice violated, his truth challenged, his holiness insulted, his wisdom and goodness impugned, whatever may be the subsequent disposition or conduct of the malefactor? And has wisdom and goodness, justice, truth, and holiness nothing to do with all this? Surely, if God's law is holy, just, and good; if eternal righteousness is in all his testimonies, and his law is the truth; then must all his moral excellencies be naturally and necessarily enlisted and pledged to vindicate and defend it. It is a physical axiom, that "every thing acts as it is;" that is, *according to its nature.* From this rule there can be no exception, as long as any thing, justly called nature, is to be found in the universe. It is upon the certainty of this fundamental truth and the perfection of the divine nature, that we predicate the immutability of God. If, therefore, his law may be broken with impunity, that is, without the infliction of a just recompense of reward; then, either the above scripture attributes of the law, or of the lawgiver, are false; or, the above axiom is not true. Here is a trilemma. The objector may adopt what side he please. From this triple choice he has but one conceivable alternative; namely, to assert that the divine law has no penalty but for the impenitent transgressor. But this would do away forgiveness altogether; for such a law would equally justify the obedient subject, and the penitent transgressor. And this, indeed, is that milder evangelic law, which many contend for, who deny the real divinity, and legal substitution of Jesus Christ. In the mean time, I am sorry to see, that this supposed modification of law is, indeed, the alternative you seem disposed to adopt: for finding fault with the supplement "*guilty,*" in the king's translation, (Exod. xxxiv. 7.) you supply the term "*impenitent;*" and in the sequel admitting Christ's substitution for argument sake, you come to the same conclusion respecting forgiveness that I have done, and must do, by admitting your supplement "impenitent;" namely, that by so doing, there could be no forgiveness at all. But, with what force of argument have you come to this conclusion? Why —If they were cleared from their debts by a surety paying them for them, then they ceased to be subjects of forgiveness, for they had nothing to be forgiven, &c. This we grant would be true in matters of a pecuniary nature, amongst fellow-creatures, under a law recognizing this principle, and who, except by voluntary compact, were mutually independent of each other in these matters: but this is by no means the case between God and his guilty creatures; for they are, first, his absolute property; they owe themselves and all they have to him; absolute unbounded subjection to his will is their indispensable duty; his law recognizes this, consequently makes no provision for any alternative in case of failure, but the absolute endurance of the threatened punishment: therefore, in case of transgression, they have nothing else to expect, having nothing left that is not forfeited—nothing

to offer by way of reparation; wherefore they lie absolutely at the divine mercy. But there are also the divine justice, truth, and holiness to be maintained and displayed as well as mercy, if mercy be exercised. To maintain truth the sentence of the law must be executed; to exercise justice, the execution of the sentence must be apportioned to the demerit of the crime; to the display of holiness, the divine aversion to moral turpitude must also be adequately manifested. Now God himself, of his own free love, having made ample provision for all this, in and by the mediation of his own Son, independent of every creature, freely and graciously exhibits and confers his pardons for Christ's sake, and through him;—whom he has set forth, a propitiatory, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God—to declare at this time his righteousness, that *he might be just*, and *the justifier of him* who believeth in Jesus. Thus we see God has glorified his justice as well as his mercy in the salvation of sinners by the blood of his son; by whose obedience to death, even the death of the cross, he has magnified his law and made it honorable; thus evincing to the whole creation the infinite evil of sin, and also his infinite justice in suffering no instance of disobedience to pass without the infliction of a just recompense of reward. So that the Apostle finds himself authorized, upon the exhibition of this awfully glorious demonstration, to challenge the whole creation; saying, "Do we then make void the law through faith? By no means; but we establish the law." How? By pardoning the penitent? If so, the forgiveness of such must be a part of the law,—it must be law: consequently, the penal clause must read thus;—"Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them, except he repent." If this were the case, not to pardon the penitent would be a violation of the law—to pardon him would be to establish it. Nay, there would be, properly, no pardon in the case; the requirement of the law being fulfilled, the penitent would be justified by the law and not by special favor—not by grace, contrary to the express testimony of the Scripture. And who would willingly commit himself to the protection of such a law! Where would be his safety for life, character, or property? Blessed be God, there is no such law, either in heaven or hell!

But my respected friend and brother seems difficulted with King James' supplement, Exod. xxxiv. 7. "*the guilty*," in place of which he would supply "*the impenitent:*" but as supplements are in a great measure arbitrary, making no part of the text, we are at liberty to reject them, and ought to do so, where they seem to involve insuperable difficulties, as in the present case. In this way the text will read, "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands,—forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin; and that will by no means clear;—visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children to the third and fourth." In the second commandment we have the definitive adjunct—"of them that hate

me." Now according to the grammatical structure of this long complex sentence, it may, and *ought* to be pointed as above; by which it is divided into three grand clauses, the second and third of which are divided by a dash (—) into antecedent and consequent; the antecedent expressing what the Lord will do with his people; the consequent showing how he would do it—the latter being explanatory of the former. Thus the Lord would "keep mercy for thousands—by forgiving their iniquity, transgression, and sin;" "and that he would by no means clear;" (that is, absolve or acquit,) which he would do by visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children to the third and fourth [generation] of them that hated him." Understanding the passage thus, your first difficulty vanishes. Your second, respecting the phrase, "*by no means*," affects not the present argument, and is the result of laying an undue stress upon the form of the expression, which is equivalent to '*not at all*'—expressing a strong negation, without any respect to "*means*," as you may see by consulting the original;—literally, "And that acquitting does not acquit," a Hebraism like that, Genesis ii. 17. "dying, thou shalt die." Upon the whole, the Lord, in this glorious declaration of his great name, gives his people to understand that, notwithstanding he is merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping covenant and mercy for thousands—forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin: yet he would by no means suffer sin to pass with impunity—that those who rejected covenanted mercy, that is, remission through blood, he would account and treat as enemies from generation to generation. We know the event has proved this interpretation true; therefore we are sure we have not mistaken the Lord's meaning. Facts are the infallible expositors of divine predictions, promises, and threatenings.

Again, dear brother, while I agree with you, that "we must repent or perish;" that "to the impenitent neither the life, the death, the blood, the intercession, the word of Christ, nor any other means, can ever effect remission of sins;" yet I can neither agree with you nor N. W. that "these means, just stated, can avail us nothing farther than to *lead* us to repentance;" for, as I have already shown, there was acceptable repentance in the world four thousand years before those means were exhibited: nor do I, in so saying, "condemn the doctrine of the moral influence of the blood of the Saviour," nor of any of the means above stated. I only assert that they avail us *something farther* than *merely* to lead us to repentance; the blood of Christ leads us to justification through faith in it. Rom. iii. 24, 25. without which repentance could avail us nothing. Then comes adoption through the same channel. Gal. iv. 4. and iii. 26. Then the spirit of adoption. Gal. iv. 6. Then sanctification by the same means. Heb. xiii. 12. Lastly, eternal redemption. Heb. ix. 12. So that Christ crucified, as Paul preached him, "is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." 1 Cor. i. 30. And as righteousness under the divine government entitles to all good, therefore he is emphatically styled "the Lord our righteous-

ness." Jer. xxiii. 6. For, by virtue of our relation to him, we are actually entitled to all good. Rom. viii. 15—17. and 1 Cor. ii. 22, 23.

And now why should my dear brother, who has so long and so strenuously contended for a pure scriptural reformation, join issue with N——. W——. to degrade the mediation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, into a mere moral argument to produce repentance, like the ministry of John, that great Elijah of the New Institution, who also sealed his ministry with his blood? You declare you do not approve of all he has written even upon this subject—much less should I suppose you approve of his other writings; but let me tell you, that this doctrine of the mere moral influence of the mediation of Christ upon the salvation of men, is the very summit and superstructure of them all. Why, then, should you concur with him, in vindicating a doctrine which goes to condemn the redeeming and justifying influence of the blood of Jesus, and which in the article of remission goes to justify both God and man? [see again Rom. iii. 24—26.] without the shedding of which there was no redemption of transgressions from the foundation of the world. Heb. ix. 22. and x. 4. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, the called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." In my former quotation of this text you objected to the insertion of the word "called," after the explanatory clause, (namely, under that covenant) supposing that I meant to affirm that the first covenant called those that were under it to an eternal inheritance. Howbeit, I neither said nor thought any such thing; but only that many of them were expectants of such an inheritance, (see Heb. xi. 13—16.) and that those came to the enjoyment of it by virtue of his death, without which they must have been disappointed. But let us review the text: "And, for this cause, he is the mediator of the new covenant." For what cause? Is it not for the peculiar efficacy of his priesthood in purifying the conscience from guilt, which no other priest had ever effected? (See the preceding context, from the 6th verse to the 14th.) "That by means of death"—for what?—"for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant." Does not this mean the transgressions that were committed under it? "The called might receive the promise," &c. What called? Why, they that had been called—not those that should be called hereafter. Does the perfect participle passive ever signify future time? and when immediately connected in construction with an adjunct of the past time, must it not be rendered by the sign of the pluperfect tense? And is not this exactly the case here?—"The transgressions that *were under the first covenant*, they that *had been* called might receive"—What? Why, the very thing they were looking for; namely, "the promise of the eternal inheritance." For "all these having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. xi. 39, 40. Let us see now how *you* understand it. You say, "The Mediator by death redeemed from the

transgressions of the first Testament." Redeemed whom? You must mean persons; for such only *are*, or *can be*, redeemed from transgressions: but, observe, the text says the redemption of the *transgressions*, not of *the transgressors;* these were dead and gone, consequently past redemption; but their sins were on file, recorded in blood, according to the law for remission, and the blood of Christ, that is, of the new covenant, balanced the account; so that all the redeemed, from the protomartyr Abel to the end of this world, will all eternally sing one and the same song,—"Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation!" No matter when or where they lived or died. They are all bought with the same price, and are joint heirs of the same inheritance. Glory to God and the Lamb forever and ever!

Dear brother, my sheet is done. I must take my leave for the present. I hope you will impartially consider what I have written in reply to your favor. You "have long since lost your pride of opinion." I hope so have I. You profess to love and seek the truth; and so do I. May the Lord lead and keep us in the truth!

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

Professor Stuart on the Mode of Baptism.

NO. IV.

TO worship God in spirit and to worship him in truth, is a worship most acceptable in his sight. To this definition of acceptable worship all must assent, on account of the high authority from which it emanates. But is this worship to be understood as our Professor views it, as the Quaker views it, as different from the worship of those who are conscientious to keep all the commandments of Jesus exactly according to his word? Is it impossible for the believer, who, on the confession of his faith, is immersed in water into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, thus to worship God in spirit and in truth; and only possible for him who is wholly indifferent whether the Lord would have him sprinkled or immersed—whether he should himself obey this commandment or his father obey it for him? If so, then the Quaker is the most spiritual worshipper, because he disdains bread, wine, and water, as carnal; and argues that the dumb praises God more acceptably than he who sings psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs!

Now if Mr. Stuart desires to know how his worship sounds in our ears, and strikes our understanding, he has only to reflect on how he hears and esteems the professions of the Quaker. Were a Quaker to tell the Professor that his views of Christianity teach him to disdain his worship as being according to the letter—as being carnal and not spiritual—let him look for an answer for him, and he will find one for himself. Would he not tell a Quaker friend, 'Sir, you cannot worship God in *truth*, unless you worship him according to his word: for "*his word is the truth.*" He that keeps not his commandments, and pro-

fesses to know him, is deceived, or "is a liar, and the truth is not in him." His commandments are expressed in words: these words have a meaning; and he that obeys not according to the word, obeys not at all. It is in vain to talk of worshipping God in spirit, if he is not worshipped in truth.'

In so answering the Quaker, the Professor furnishes us with an answer to himself. And certainly, if his logic be sound in rebutting the pretensions of the Quaker, it is equally sound in rebutting his own plea for worshipping God in truth, while professing perfect indifference as to the manner of that worship. He will not say, I am persuaded, that "*in truth*" means *sincerely:* for that would be to plead for the most absurd principle of religious worship, and would justify every system under heaven; and even set on foot again the long repudiated doctrine that "ignorance is the mother of devotion."

If sincerity constitute the justifying righteousness of the professed worshippers of God, then may the whole world of sincere Turks, Jews, Deists, Sceptics, and Heretics of every name, be the acceptable worshippers of God. To worship God in truth, then, is not merely to worship God sincerely; but to worship him according to his revealed will. He who substitutes the will of man, or the traditions of men, for the will of God and the traditions of the Apostles, presents strange fire upon God's altar; and his doing it sincerely only proves that his "eye is not sound"—that he prefers something to the oracles of God—to THE LIGHT of the world; and, consequently, the more sincere the more worthy of reprobation. Were it otherwise, Jesus could not have so repudiated those, who, in the most perfect sincerity, as doing service to God, put his Apostles to death. "He that kills you will think that he does God service." Sincerity, constancy, perseverance, and all of this class are commendable only while associated with truth and goodness. Divorce them from this alliance, and they are of no account; associate them with error, and they are worthy of reprobation. We need not argue this point; for our learned Professor doubtless will agree with us, that, to worship God in truth, means more than to worship him sincerely. If so, then, he can worship God in truth only by keeping his commandments, This being conceded, and then the question returns in all its force, Has God commanded two sorts of baptism—has he commanded both the action of sprinkling and of immersing? If he have commanded both, both are obligatory. If he have left it discretionary, either will be acceptable. But if he have commanded immersion, then sprinkling is an abomination—it is will-worship—it is like offering swine's flesh instead of a lamb.

We say that Jesus Christ either would not or could not find in the language of mortals a word of definite import—a word that could definitely express the action which he designed. If he could, and would not, then he willed ambiguity and uncertainty, and intended to divide his followers. If he would, and could not find an unequivocal word, then the language in which he spoke was unfit to be the vehicle of his communication. But this cannot be urged; for no language ever was more definite than the Greek, *and no word in that language*

is more definite than BAPTIZO. We challenge the Professor to name the word in that language more definite than *baptizo*. He has a thousand witnesses to prove its acceptation; and certainly no figurative or remote meaning will be urged by him as declarative of any ambiguity; for he knows too well that every word of common use has its figurative and remote meanings, as well as its current literal import, and that these are never contrary to it. He has not done this. He is too candid to attempt it; and if he should, all his philological canons of criticism would pass sentence upon him.

But, perhaps, he may not regard it as the duty of any one to be immersed, but the duty of parents to have their offspring baptized. There is a difficulty here which we do not recollect to have seen fully explained. The Paidobaptists contend that baptism is a duty enjoined only on parents relative to their children, except in the case of pagan or infidel ancestors. Hence in a Christian community, such as the Paidobaptist, it is the duty of no one to be baptized, but to baptize others, or to have others baptized. If a child grow up to manhood without baptism, the sin is not his, but his father's, mother's, or guardian's. It cannot be binding on both father and child. If the duty of the former, it is not the duty of the latter; and if the duty of the latter, it is not the duty of the former. Hence the indifference of many professors about it. They cannot understand how a command to fathers concerning their duty as fathers, can be obligatory on their children; or how it can be a sin in any person to neglect that which was only obligatory on his father. And will every person admit, that if this command be addressed to both parents and children—on the parents absolutely, and on the children only in case of the failure of the parents—it is an anomally among all the institutions of Heaven. But in the New Testament, it is conceded, that there is not one word or command to parents concerning any such matter. In these circumstances of this extraordinary "rite," I seek (but, perhaps, in vain) to find an excuse for my friend Stuart—I mean an excuse for his indifference as to his own obedience. He, indeed, in this case appears to worship God without obedience at all; for he never was either sprinkled or immersed with his own consent, or upon his own responsibility; and as far as he is *personally* concerned, he is like a Quaker, worshipping in spirit only, except that as a father, he may have obeyed some commandment in reference to his children.

The Professor appears, to my optics, at fault on two other counts found in this essay, which may require each an essay from my pen. In the mean while I most respectfully tender the above remarks, and would feign indulge the hope that our very learned and worthy Professor may be induced to put the question to himself, Whether he can worship God acceptably while he worships him without obedience to a command once enjoined by the holder of the keys of the kingdom of heaven—"*Be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins*"?

EDITOR.

Converting Power.

WELLSBURG, 2*d August*, 1833.

Dear Sir,

I AGREE with you, that "in all logical discussions there is nothing like coming to the point, and then keeping to it." But you have not convinced me that I have rambled from any point or proposition *plainly* announced by you, and disputed by me.

Let us look back to the commencement of our correspondence. In my first communication I advised you of what I understood to be your opinions on the subject of spiritual influence, as set forth in your "Dialogue on the whole work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men." I said, *in substance*, that I understood you to confine the influence of the gospel to the power of moral suasion; or, in other words, that the Author of Christianity no more aids us in *understanding* and *obeying* the gospel, than the spirit of Newton or Paley aids us in understanding and practising the truths contained in their works. This I understand to be your *theory* of Christianity in relation to spiritual *influence*.

I was led to this conclusion by a careful perusal of the dialogue. I could draw no other inference from it, without explaining away the design of the work. I knew this to be the conclusion of many candid men who had read your writings; in fact, the common belief of all with whom I had any conversation, was, that you denied the doctrine of special influence as held by other churches.

Supposing you to be consistent, I concluded that you embraced the philosophical hypothesis, which supposes that the Deity has never *influenced* or *suspended* the laws of *nature*, except in cases of miracles, since the foundation of the world.

Several of your expressions in your reply to your friend Thompson justified me in this belief. His objections to your dialogue were, that your opinions *subverted* a plain practical duty. He asked you, as every man of common sense must, If all the converting power is in the word, why should we pray for our unconverted friends? How did you reply to this common sense objection? Did you tell him, that *although* all the *converting* power was in the word—that God, by a special providence, might, in *answer to prayer*, sanctify afflictions, and make them instrumental in awakening our irreligious friends, or that an angel might be sent, who would, by impressions and suggestions, lead them to read and *digest* the written word, by which they might be converted? No, my dear sir, you gave no intimations of any power or influence out of the word that would, in answer to prayer, be brought to bear on the minds of our irreligious friends, to bring them to God. You said, indeed, that nature is dependant upon God, and yields her influences at his will—but this is said by Bigland and others, who deny a special providence.

You attributed to prayer no influence, but what I called for *distinction's* sake, its natural influence. You did not show, or attempt to

show that your theory was consistent with your practice in praying for your unconverted friends. You, indeed, admitted prayer to be a duty; but endeavored to get clear of the charge of inconsistency by resolving it into a mystery. I demurred to this course, and said that if what I understood to be your theory of the divine government was true, prayer was absurd.

After having read many of your essays on the Holy Spirit, and seen your replies to objections, I concluded that your religious opinions on the doctrine of Providence and spiritual influence accorded with the celebrated Dr. Priesly. He denies that men are assisted in any way in the work of salvation, but by the moral influence of the word—this he says is sufficient to account for all the high attainments of the martyrs. The primitive Christians he charges with *enthusiasm*, because, in their fiery trials, they believed they were *specially* supported. When asked to reconcile his theory with his practice in praying, he resolves it into a mystery. I have a high opinion of the exalted virtue and varied genius of Dr. Priestly, but have always considered this a great error in his religious opinions.

In your kind reply to my communication you disavow the doctrine of a general providence, which excludes a particular one, and admit that God exercises a special providence over men. This you think is principally carried on by angels. These heavenly intelligences you admit may influence only by *suggestions*, *motives*, and *impressions*. In your last you say, that "men, good and bad—evil spirits, angels, good and bad, pestilence, earthquakes, sudden deaths, personal and family afflictions, may become the occasions of conversions to God—*but they are not God's converting power*."

By these "becoming the *occasions* of men's conversion," I suppose you mean that God in his providence designs them to produce this effect, and that in many instances they do. That you agree with the great Butler and Sherlock, that life is a state of trial or moral discipline in reference to a future state—that you view Providence in this light, I infer from the fact, that you approve of Sherlock's work, and are publishing it in the Harbinger.

But you blame me for calling such influence converting power. It is is no more converting power, you say, "than the pill-box is an essential part of the healing power of the pills it contains." But according to your own admission, angels have access to the minds of men—to their wills, and by assuming the form of a *thought* or word—turn them to suit their purpose." But pill-boxes are not given by physicians to their patients as a part of their prescriptions—they do not have access to the secretions of the physical system as the spiritual agency of angels do to the operations of the mind—if they did I should not hesitate to call their influence in the cure of the disease *healing power*, or *healing* influence.*

*Again you beg the question at issue.

Where has God said that all the converting power is in the *written word*—as you make your physician say that all his healing power is in the medicine? This is the very question at issue between us. And is begging the question

But to come to the point at issue between us. You admit a special providence—the ministry of angels—and have not denied but what God makes impressions on our minds by his own spirit. You also admit that the various afflictions of life, with all its blessings, may be the *occasions* of bringing us to God, or converting us; and as I said before, I understand you to mean that they are so ordered by God. All this kind of influence you admit; but you will not call it *converting* power—that you still contend is in the word—all the converting power of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Then it seems that the question at issue between us is not whether there is not influence given us in answer to prayer out of the word—for you admit there is; but what it shall be *called*. For several reasons I shall call it special influence, or converting power. But you, my dear sir, may call it what you please. I will not controvert with you about the name—although I agree with Dr. G. Campbell, that names are sometimes of great importance in theological disputations.

1st. I call it converting power, because it is a power exerted by God in direct relation to our salvation. I believe that all the arrangements of Providence in this state of trial have for their ultimate object the salvation of men—in particular, that spiritual agency which is brought to bear immediately in the mind in various ways, and which leads us to *understand*, and helps us to *obey* the word of God.

2d. Because this influence is *efficient*—it arouses the sinner—it strengthens the grace of the saint, and renders him victorious in the hour of temptation—it gives order to devotion—it opens our eyes so that we understand more fully the word of God.

3d. Because such are my views of the depravity of the human heart, that if it were not for this kind of influence, *which is out of the word*, but under the immediate direction of God, the written word—the enjoyment of the Holy Spirit would be of no great importance—its *native* influence, or moral power, would not make practical Christians.

4th. Because this kind of agency has been called spiritual agency by some of our ablest and most accurate writers. This will appear from the following quotations:—Dr. Paley, in his sermons on Spiritual Influence, says, "The Spirit may act, and observation affords reason to believe that it does, by adding force and efficacy to instruction,

what you call "sticking to the point"? Excellent logic, indeed! Grant you this, and you can do finely. But there is a want of analogy in another respect in your medical illustration.

If the friends of sick persons and nurses bear the same relation to physicians, and were as much a part of their medical establishment as *angels* and the *Holy Spirit* is of the divine government in the salvation of men—if they gave counsel for the physician and produced an influence on the operations of the system as important in the case of the disease, as the spiritual influence I contend for, is to the salvation of men—then I should not hesitate to call their aid *healing* aid, or *healing* power. When angels inflict judgment on sinners, is it not called God's work, and said to be done by his power?

Your analogies, friend Campbell, do not appear to me to be "right to the point."

advice, or admonition; a passage of Scripture sometimes strikes the *heart* with wonderful *power*, adheres, as it were, and cleaves to the memory till it has wrought its work. An impressive sermon is often known to sink very deep. Mr. J. Specke, in controversy with Doctor Miller, makes use of similar language.*

*In this work they believe the Spirit of God aids and guides, encourages, and strengthens. Its influence is efficient or effectual, according to the disposition of every individual, and the efforts which are made to resist evil and conform to the laws of virtue. God is always present with his Spirit to assist those who ask his favor, and who will profit by his counsels. He does not act upon them with a power which they cannot oppose. This would be destroying moral freedom, and rendering the rules and motives of the gospel unnecessary and inoperative.

Many things conspire to produce the change of regeneration, or a thorough renewal of heart and character. Means are used here as in every thing else. The moral discipline, to which all persons are subjected, constitute a very large part of these means. Every occurrence in life, which makes the sinner reflect on the frail tenure of his existence, his dependence on God, the evil of sin, and the danger of a wicked course, contributes something to the work of reformation. Whatever calms the passions, warms the affections, exalts and purifies the character, or promotes goodness in any way, has the same tendency. Hence the advantage of preaching the word, diffusing a knowledge of the Scriptures, and establishing and supporting good institutions; all of which would be unnecessary, *if men are to be regenerated, or brought into a state of holiness, by the immediate influence, or irresistible impulse of divine power.*— Unitarians believe, and preach, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" and in consistency with this belief, they exhort all men to embrace the conditions of the gospel by a constant observance of its laws, unceasing piety, and rigid virtue.

In addition to what has been said above, respecting the influence of the Holy Spirit, the following, from a work of high authority and just celebrity, may probably be considered as expressing the views of Unitarians generally:— "They do not reject the notion of a direct and immediate influence of the Spirit of God on the human mind. They believe that there may be circumstances of great trial, strong temptation, and peculiar difficulty, that call for extraordinary assistance, and that those who have manifested a disposition to make a good use of the ordinary means afforded, will have further aid suited to their exigencies, and sufficient, by a proper use, to answer to their necessities. They suppose, also, that extraordinary assistance will be granted only to those who ask it; that it will be granted to previous good disposition, and a sense of need and dependence; that God will give the Holy Spirit to them who ask, to them who have already right feelings, are sensible of their weaknesses and wants, and ask the mercy of God to supply them."

From what has been said, it is to be inferred that Unitarians differ from Calvinists not in the *object to be attained* by conversion, but respecting the *manner* by which it is attained. Unitarians hold a divine influence, and that men are converted by this influence; but they do not believe it to be irresistible, or miraculous. They conceive that God is always ready to second their good intentions and purposes, to aid their virtuous efforts, listen to their prayers, show mercy to the penitent, and to pardon their sins when repented of and forsaken. They believe conversion to be the work of God, not in the way of an arbitrary, irresistible agency, but by the innnmerable motives and inducements which he employed to bring men to a just sense of their duty, a deep reverence of his character, love of his laws, and a habitual desire for purity of mind and holiness of life. Whatever leads to these results, may be considered as proceeding from the Spirit of God. This spirit may operate through *good instructions,* or

5th. I call it converting power, or spiritual influence, because the Bible often attributes to affictions and blessings a moral influence. Solomon says we should go to the house of mourning, because it will make our hearts better. Afflictions are said to produce the "peaceable fruits of righteousness;" and so great are their influence or power, that the prophet personifies them and represents them as speaking in the language of strong rebuke: "Hear you the voice of the rod and him that hath appointed it." Now if sanctified affliction and angelic influence are so ordered by God, as to be the means of turning men from sin to God, why should not such *special* agency be called, *converting power* or *spiritual aid?* It is as strictly from God as the written word, and given for the same end. I admit that such *aid* would not convert men and turn them to God without a previous knowledge of the Supreme Being. Its efficacy depends on a previous knowledge of Deity, made known to us by revelation or reason. Now would any number of words, written or spoken by God himself, ever convert men, and change their hearts, and fit them for heaven, without divine aid—assistance out of the word? for prayer supposes such aid: and a soul converted without prayer would be a strange phenomenon.

Before you close you give me a text to consider: "The gospel is the power of God to salvation." From this text I suppose you infer that *all the converting power is in the written word.* But I would ask you if you are certain that Paul alludes *exclusively* to the written word? This, I presume, you will not say. I suppose he referred to the gospel as "preached by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." If I am not mistaken, Paul attributes *power* to the gospel, because it was accompanied with the Holy Spirit. You will not, I presume, predicate that of *written words, unaided by any invisible agency*, which Paul predicates of words spoken by living men and attested by miraculous agency. That Paul's gospel supposed *spiritual aid*, I infer from a passage in the very epistle from which you select your text.

any thing, in fact, which disposes the mind to thoughtfulness and serious inquiry. *Sudden deep afflictions, an impressive sermon, certain passages in the word of God*, may, by the agency of the Divine Spirit, be brought down upon the soul with a power which will terminate in conversion, by opening the eyes of men to their true character, and causing them to see the folly and danger of sin. But in these operations there is no force nor compulsion—nothing which may not be resisted, and which is not resisted by all, who, under the same circumstances, receive no impression.

This is consistent with the Scripture view of the subject. Conversion is never represented there as coming from *an irresistible act of divine power*, or as being brought about in consequence of a *divine decree.* We are told, "Grieve not the Spirit of God." But why thus told, unless the Spirit may be grieved, or resisted? "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted," says the Apostle. But why this command, if we have not power to obey it, and are to be *passive* until it shall please God to raise us up by a miracle? St. Paul's conversion was miraculous, and is the most remarkable one recorded in Scripture; and yet, in his speech before Agrippa, he says that he "was not *disobedient* to the heavenly vision," intimating, as a learned writer has observed, that his freedom of choice was not restrained, but that his conversion was on his part an act of voluntary obedience and virtue.

How is the sinner to be delivered from the body of sin and death under which the epistle represents him to groan? By a spiritual agency, says Paul. "But if the Spirit of God, who had power to raise Jesus Christ from the dead, dwell in you, *as certainly it does*, he that raised Christ from the dead is certainly able, and will, by his Spirit that dwells in you, enliven even your *mortal bodies*, that sin shall not have the sole power and rule there, but your members may be made living instruments of righteousness."—*Locke's paraphrase, verse* 11, *chap. viii. Romans.*

You see from this quotation that our philosopher represents Paul's preaching a gospel that promises a spiritual agency *out of the written word.* I know you interpret "*mortal bodies*" to mean dead bodies in the grave, and refer the *quickening* to the resurrection. But Mr. Locke says that "*mortal*" is no where in the New Testament attributed to any thing void of life. Your interpretation Mr. L. calls "*an uncouth one*," and says "it makes St. Paul, in the midst of a very serious, strong, and coherent discourse, concerning 'walking after the Spirit,' skip in a sudden into the mention of 'the resurrection of the dead;' and having just mentioned it, skip back again into his former argument. But I take the liberty to assure him that St. Paul has no such *starts* from the matter he has in hand, to what gives no light or strength to his present argument."

So you see I contend that the gospel offers spiritual aid—that spiritual assistance is a part of that gospel which is "the power of God to salvation;" and then we arrive at the point where we started—*Is there any aid in the work of salvation out of the written word?* You say in your essay "*on the whole work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men*," that there is not; all the "converting power is in the *written* word." This you affirm, and *this* is what I deny.

But I do not wish, brother Campbell, to have "a war of words" with you; and that we may know in what we differ, I submit the following propositions:—

Do you admit that God gives us the kind of assistance set forth by Paley and Specks?

If you do, you may call it what you please—*spiritual aid*, or *influence*—spiritual influence, or *assisting* power, if you will not call it *converting* power.

Candor on your part will certainly admit that *things only* are worthy any dispute. Logomachy is too trifling for a lover of truth. If you differ from me in *things*, will you show me in what that difference consists?

Yours sincerely,

J. A. WATERMAN.

MR. A. CAMPBELL.

P. S. You intimate that in illustrating spiritual and angelic agency in the conversion of men, I "should have begun with a sinner, and not a saint." And did I not begin with a great sinner—a *thief?* Now we *sectarians*, who live in "Babylon," call thieves *sinners*, and

think they need conversion; and the *power* which causes them to quit their evil course and turn to God, we call *converting power*.—Besides, you should recollect that the title of your essay is, "The Whole Work of the Holy Spirit in the *Salvation* of Men."

J. A. W.

REPLY.

MR. WATERMAN,

Dear Sir—IN the absence of any positive testimony for spiritual influence *out of the word*, in the work of converting sinners, you very candidly say, that you have no wish to contend about *a name*, provided we can agree about *the thing*. So let it be. I have no love for strifes of words, and no time for a war of words. The point now between us is this: Can we call, or regard those occurrences, or providences, which you have named, converting power? You give *five reasons* why you think they may be regarded as of that nature. These do not, in my judgment, prove that the Holy Spirit ever acts upon the mind of an unconverted sinner out of the word. You would at once convince me of the truth of your theory, could you find any one scripture, in Old Testament or New, which affirms that out of, or independent of, the word written or spoken by Prophets and Apostles, the Spirit of God works faith in the mind of the natural man.

With me all religion begins in faith, and a religious faith not founded on the testimony of God, is wholly a conceit. "How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard?" With Paul and your humble servant this is a rank impossibility.

I said something about keeping to the point, which you seem to have misapplied; for you still present another point than the one I have before me. You say, "The question at issue between us is not whether there is not influence given us in answer to prayer out of the word; for you admit there is: but what it shall be called." Do you think, my dear sir, that the question between us is, What shall we call the influence given to Christians in answer to prayer? If so, I have wholly mistaken the matter: for, according to my proposition, it is about *unconverted* persons, and not *praying* Christians, we are talking. It is about converting power—and surely converted persons, praying to God for his Holy Spirit, are not within the jurisdiction of our premises. With me a person praying to God, through Jesus Christ, is not an unbeliever—an unconverted person.

Concerning that aid or assistance, or spiritual power bestowed on them in answer to prayer, I have no controversy with you. That the Holy Spirit is given to them who believe in and obey Jesus Christ, that God works in them to will and do what is right, I positively affirm. Peter explicitly declares this, Acts v. 31, 32. But, my dear sir, I will explain to you *the things* in which, if I mistake not, we do really differ; but previous to my doing this, I will first advert, in general terms, to the whole document you have laid before me.

In reply to your letter before me, and that we may understand each other and the subject of discussion better, I will introduce an analogy

covering the whole area of what you would call this our logomachy about converting power.

Concerning the pestilence which has recently passed over us, we have had volumes of theory. In these conflicting theories some two or three points are, on all hands, conceded. Those will answer my purpose. It is agreed that the *cholera power* is in the atmosphere; that some derangement of that fluid, or some foreign element combined with it, is the power that produces cholera. I use this cholera power as analogous to my views of the converting power in reference to our discussion in the following particulars:—

1. The cholera power is wholly in the atmosphere, and unless that atmosphere is present no cholera can exist. A genuine case of cholera cannot be produced by any other cause. To apply this point as we proceed: You argue that there is a cholera power *out of the atmosphere.* I argue that it is wholly in the atmosphere, and that without the presence of that peculiar atmosphere no case of cholera can, by any other cause, be produced.

2. The cholera power equally pervades a certain district at a certain time. In that district, and under that influence, some of the inhabitants become subjects of the disease; but all do not. So of the converting power, or gospel; it pervades a certain district at a certain time; some obey it, or fall under its influence —all do not. On this second point of analogy there is no dispute.

3. But why do not all fall victims to the cholera on its first appearance? It is agreed that there is a certain predisposition of the body necessary to the production of the disease, even where the cholera power is present. No dispute between Mr. Waterman and me on this point either.

Those whom the cholera power finds predisposed are the first victims. "But," say the Doctors, "the cholera power will, in some instances, when operating for a while upon the body, so debilitate it, that it falls under the action of the poison or producing power; and," continue the Doctors, "there are some bodies that will resist this influence and remain unhurt by the contagion, unless some excess or some debilitating agent acts in concert with it." All this may be matter of certainty. At all events, and on any hypothesis, it will aptly illustrate our views. There are, then, three or four classes of bodies as respects the cholera influence. Some it finds predisposed on its first appearance; others it reduces to that state favorable to its reception; others will not yield to it unless some concurring cause, some debilitating excess or agent, reduce their bodies below the power of resistance; and there are some, that, during the whole time of its continuance, and under all circumstances, are never very sensibly affected by it. And is not this the history of the fortunes of the converting power as given in the parables of the Messiah? Some obey the gospel on the first hearing of it; others parry its convictions for a while, but eventually yield; others again are reduced by adverse providences, special occurrences, extraordinary events, and brought under its control; and are there not many, who, during their whole

lives are but little influenced by it, and concerning whom it will be said, 'The day is past, the harvest is ended, and they are not saved!'

Now for our controversy. You will not say that there are none of the first and second class—you will admit there are some, who, like the Ethiopian eunuch, obey at the first hearing—some, like the Bereans, who, after a little reflection and examination, will obey—there are some, who, like a certain company of the priests, finally become obedient to the faith; and there are some, like Galio, who care nothing about it.

But, say you, these concurring or exciting causes are of the same nature with the power which converts. Well, look at the analogy before us! Will you call the special excesses, or the debilitating agents which reduce the body, *cholera power?* On reflection you will say, that these exciting causes could produce no cholera, were the cholera power absent; that they only concur with it; and that often without them the infection takes effect. Just so in the history of the converting power. Some are so stimulated by the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life, that they never yield to it. And there are not wanting numerous instances where some special providence, favorable or unfavorable to temporal interests, brings the mind to act conformably with *previous* knowledge.

Let me wander so far from the subject before us as to say, that you seemed at one time unable to reconcile my views of the special providence of God with these views of converting power. To me there never appeared any real incompatibility. One reason alone satisfied me. Where there is no testimony of God, and where there can be no faith even amongst the Pagans, there are special providences as amongst Christians. How many savages have been saved from fire and flood, from the arrow and the tomahawk, from the serpent and the lion, by providences as special as any of which Christians can boast? But these never converted them to God. Neither do special providences amongst us, farther than as may appear in the following part of the analogy.

4. During the presence of the cholera power, it is said, that all animal and vegetable substances are more or less impregnated with that atmospheric influence—are, in fact, *cholerafied* in different degrees. Hence the free use of such of them as are susceptible of much of the influence, become exciting and concomitant causes. But, mark you, it was the presence of the cholera power that gave them that influence. So in the history of special providences. In districts where the gospel is present, special providences, remarkable calamities, or deliverances, are *gospelized*, and act as concurring causes with the converting power; but where the converting power is not present these specialities are never seen, felt, or acknowledged.

I hope we now understand each other; and I will only repeat, that this analogy is intended to illustrate my views so far as this:—That, as the cholera influence or power is wholly in the atmosphere, and as no exciting cause can produce it where that influence is not present; so the converting power is in the gospel, and no special or particular

providence can avail any thing to conversion where that gospel is not present. But as under the cholera atmosphere a variety of causes may concur with that influence in producing the disease; so under the power of the gospel, a variety of circumstances may concur with it to the salvation of men. And in both cases, without any concurring cause, other than the natural state of the subject, both the cholera and the converting power will impregnate the system and take effect.

One word with regard to the divine arrangement of concurring causes: You think that if God intend to use any of these as means to give effect to the word preached or heard, then his design gives them a special character and fitly denominates them converting power. The selling of Joseph and the selling of Jesus were *intended* by those who sold them for an injury: but God intended them both for the redemption of his people. Shall we then call them the means of redemption! The application is easy as far as the name is concerned.

Having said so much of the gospel as the converting power—as the power of God to salvation—it may be necessary, with a reference to what you have said about the gospel, to define what we mean by "*the gospel.*" It is not the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit by which it was accompanied when first announced; but the things proved and demonstrated by that Spirit.

The oak is all in the acorn. The gospel was all in the first promise, or in that made to Abraham; but it was not fully developed till a certain period. No one, then, can understand the gospel from the first promise more than he can see the oak in the acorn. The gospel was the subject of prophecy as to the time and place of its promulgation—and even as respects the person by whom it was to be first announced. By *the gospel*, then, I mean that *word of the Lord* which began to be preached in Jerusalem according to prophecy on the day of Pentecost. See Isaiah ii. 3. Micah iv. 2. Luke xxiv. 46, 47. Acts i, 4. Matth. xvi. 19. Its power is found in the remission of sins immediately on obedience, the reception of the Holy Spirit, and in the promise of a resurrection and eternal life. These were demonstrated by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, and by the Holy Spirit which the Lord gives to all who obey him. This is the converting power for which we plead. You may have all the exciting causes which you can find in the circumstances of every individual to awaken his attention to it, and to excite them who believe it to obedience; but call not these *the power of God to salvation.*

Our Saviour needed no other philosophy than the parable of the sower to explain its success to his disciples. And there is not in all the Bible a promise of the Holy Spirit to any unbeliever. Mark iv. 26. is worthy of the consideration of all our moral philosophers, not forgetting those you have quoted. I shall transcribe it: "The kingdom of God is like seed which a man sowed in his field. While he slept by night and waked by day the seed shot up and grew WITHOUT HIS MINDING IT. For the earth produces OF ITSELF first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. But as soon as the grain

was ripe he applied the sickle because it was time to reap it." If, then, we would be philosophers of the common sense school, we will scatter the seed—*preach the word;* and without any theory of the soil or of the process of vegetation, allow it to grow according to the genius of this parable.

I now come to what I regard as the things in which I fear we differ. Having no promise nor declaration that the Spirit of God, *without the word*, works faith in unbelievers, by a power independent of the word, I do differ from all who aim at producing faith, or effecting conversion to God, by any other means than producing the testimony of God. God forbid that I should make known any thing among sinners but Christ crucified, as the means of their reconciliation to God!

My dear sir, the world is full of religion-makers and religion-seekers. One man makes a religion, and others seek to get it. Those who are getting religion, or striving to get religion, and those who are making religion, are equally in error The Christian religion is already made, fully revealed and published to the world; and in it "*God is reconciling us to himself*," and *beseeching* us to receive it. Many preach that we are to labor to get religion by propitiating the Deity. They teach sinners to struggle "to bring down Christ from above," while "the word is nigh them." Hence many called converted, are only converted to seek religion. They are converted to seek by prayer and penance to be converted. One would think that all converting power was found in prayers and tears, in sighs and groans, if he were to judge from what is preached and practised at most of our camp-meetings, whether they are Methodistic, Presbyterian, or Baptist camp-meetings: for latterly, you know, that the straw, the altar, and the mourning bench are got into fashion amongs your former enemies. They envy the success of those whom they denounced as enthusiastic Arminians; and now the sons of John Calvin and John Wesley are fighting with the same weapons. I am not sure but we may differ about the propriety of such substitutes for the means of conversion adopted by the Apostles; and about the propriety of teaching persons to pray for aid to be converted.

The Bible difference amongst men is very simple and intelligible. All are regarded as receiving or rejecting the testimony of God—as believers or unbelievers in the pretensions of Jesus. It is safest, in my judgment, to proceed upon these well established principles, and to accost sinners accordingly. Before any person can pray or come to God, "he must believe that he exists; and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him."

One of my reasons for insisting so much upon the converting power, is, a conviction that some (nay, many) regard prayer as a means of conversion; and, instead of preaching Christ, preach prayer as the divinely appointed means of reformation and salvation. We, indeed, believe and teach that Christians should pray without ceasing for all things which God has promised; but, inasmuch as no Apostle ever commanded an *unbeliever*, or unbaptized person, to pray as a means of getting religion or of being converted, we cannot preach prayer as a

means of conversion. But as I may be mistaken with regard to your practice in this matter, I await your own statements.

Very sincerely your friend,

EDITOR.

P. S. Since writing the above I have turned over to the "Dialogue on the whole work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men," vol. 2 of this work, to which you have frequently alluded. In that dialogue there is introduced an idea, which, if carried out fully, explains my views of converting power, and obviates the difficulties which have occurred to you. It is is this: That all rational beings act from motives, and that the power of any argument is the amount of motive which it presents to the mind. Now as the gospel furnishes the highest conceivable motives to excite human action, it would appear very mysterious, indeed, if any document possessing arguments or motives incomparably inferior, should be found more adequate to excite mankind to actions as contrary to the bias of their nature, and as full of heroism and self-denial as any thing which Christianity requires. We would rationally infer, that, if men are moved by motives acting in unison with their love of happiness, that document which furnishes the strongest motives would have the greatest influence on men.

If, then, we see a man forsake the land of his nativity, the mother that watched over his infancy, the fascinating scenes of his childhood, his relatives and companions of his youth, and hazard life itself upon the tempestuous ocean, visit some foreign land, undergo all dangers and privations, for the sake of some temporary advantage of doubtful acquisition, through faith in human testimony, without any power out of that testimony—why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that the arguments and motives which the gospel presents, without any power out of the gospel, should influence men to that obedience which it requires? We have seen thousands and read of myriads of our race, who have, by sea and land, in a thousand enterprizes for some temporary purpose, denied themselves and exposed themselves to privations and hardships as great as ever Christianity required; nay, much greater than Jesus Christ ever required of any disciple.

It may be alleged that the same motives do not operate alike upon all. One man visits the West India islands, when the dog-star rages, and jeopardizes his life for the profits on a single cargo, from the motive of gain. Another enters the navy; another enlists in the army; this man devotes his life to mathematics, sculpture, painting, or some of the fine arts; that man seeks literary or political renown; each in his own way, according to the motives presented to his mind, encounters the toils, and privations, and dangers attendant upon his pursuits, without any other power than that of simple motive; but always adapted to his circumstances and peculiar something, called *taste*, which is itself, perhaps, the creature of motive.

Now the gospel presents motives which cannot fail to interest all mankind; but in order to this it must be understood and believed. The perishing things of time and sense may, and often do, hide it from the eyes of men; for their minds are filled with these objects. To remove these from the mind afflictions of every sort have a tendency: but often the gospel itself, without these, arrests the attention and captivates the heart. Females, because of their seclusion from the bustle of life, more than males, are more susceptible of the operation of these motives, and therefore proportionally more of them become obedient to the faith.

No power other than the motive, however, can influence human action; *and if the gospel proposes all the motives to holiness and spiritual happiness which can operate upon the human heart, it must possess all the power.* If God's Spirit has, *out of the word*, imparted any other motive to any man, he never has been able to state it to others: *for neither yourself, nor any philosopher or Christian, has been able to suggest a motive to another, besides those written in the book.* All

that is necessary, then, is to regard it as certainly true; and all that circumstances or providences can do towards this, is, to remove interposing objects, that the light may shine upon the mind; unless you contend that the Spirit works faith in the mind independent of testimony—and this I understand you to reject as well as myself. EDITOR.

New Version and Dr. Cleland.

NO. II.

IN farther illustration and corroboration of Dr. Cleland's candor, honesty, and veracity, we shall again introduce him to our readers, (a favor which our antagonists do not often confer upon us.) We are not afraid to let their preachers enter our synagogues, and deliver all their views of us; nor to let their writers appear on our pages, and publish what they have to write against us. We court examination—they seem to fear it. We can lose nothing in searching after truth—they may lose their salaries and their standing with the people. Prudence then says to them, 'Shut the pleaders for reform out of your meeting houses, and suffer them not to speak in your pages: for we must lose and they may gain if they are heard.' Let us, then, hear the Doctor:—

"Let us now examine the author's acknowledged and boasted foundation of his new version. On page 396 is found the following declaration:—"We will give no Baptist authorities------But we rest the whole authority of this translation on the criticisms of the Romanists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians." Now let the candid reader compare this ostentatious declaration with his title page, which ascribes *the whole translation* of the book to "George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge, *Doctors of the Church of Scotland*," (*in italics,*) and then ask himself, What have Romanists and Episcopalians to do, as responsible authorities, with the translation of a book specially ascribed to three learned men of a different denomination? This matter will be further attended to in the proper place. We have another specious statement of our Reformer, which at once destroys the veracity of the title page, and betrays a lack of truth and candor. Let it be well remembered, the book is expressly declared to be "translated from the original Greek, *by* George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge." So the uninformed of all classes understand it. Especially do the subalterns of Mr. Campbell, in the heat and ardor of controversy, exultingly tell us, "Here is the book translated by your own Doctors—here are their own words—their own admissions," &c. But hear the man who has sent forth this book to the public, patched up from different authors, founded "on the criticisms of the Romanists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians," altered, amended, and mutilated, with an imposing, hypocritical, lying title page—I say, hear the author himself:—"From a great many sources, and from religious teachers of different denominations, inquiries, suggestions, and criticisms have been received, all directly or indirectly bearing upon the improvement of the new version. From these, and from our own diligent comparison and examination of all the documents furnished, and within our reach, we have been induced to modernize the style of this version very considerably. 2d ed. p. 448. Now if this man has improved and very considerably modernized the style of this new version, how did he have the assurance and effrontery to ascribe this version, in its very front, to Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge? And if he has so altered and changed the style of the *second edition*, (from which the above quotation is made,) what may we not expect from the third, as he has had several years to make further improvement?"

Our first complaint against this statement is, that it tells a gross falsehood by quoting a remark from the Appendix, made on the quotations from Romanists and Protestants; which the Doctor applies not to the subject on which the remark was made, but to the whole work. The case is this:—Simon, Whitby, Hammond, Bishop Taylor, Beza, Luther, and Calvin are quoted in corroboration of immersion, as taught in the notes and criticisms of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge. On that single criticism we said (p. 396, 2d ed.) we "would give no Baptist authorities; but we rest the whole authority of this translation (*baptisma* by immersion) on the criticisms of Romanists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians. This Mr. Cleland would have the reader to believe is said of the whole version, and with this intent would have the title page compared with this remark in the Appendix on a single word!!

The next and only item remaining in this extract, is his allegation that the modernizing of the style falsifies the title page. For if we substitute *has* for *hath*, and *you* for *ye*, it is no longer the translation of the three Doctors! Grave Divine! And why does he call the common version "King James' Bible," when there are many thousand alterations in it? So rare is a pure copy of King James', that I presume Dr. Cleland never saw one. I have not leisure to count, but I will affirm on the comparisons which I have made, taking the ratio of a single book, that there are more than ten thousand alterations made in the Bible Society editions of the King's version, compared with a genuine King James' Bible!

Thus we dispose of the preceding extract. It is all chaff, without one grain of wheat; but with such food this Pastor feeds his flock!

But as the subject of change or alteration is to be often heard from these patent Doctors, I will go more fully into its examination. The title page of the third and fourth editions of the new version is wholly exempt from all the imputations of Mr. Cleland. It is set forth as containing various emendations, and is therefore, on the Doctor's premises, more consistent than the popular version: for, according to him, it is "a hypocritical and lying title page." It purports to be what it is not. At least many editions of it are set forth as appointed by the King to be read in the churches, which editions neither King James nor any other King appointed to be read. Some American editions have, from the republican hatred of Kings which is popular here, omitted the King's name, and the ancient prefaces and dedications to his *Majesty*, and set it forth as the Holy Bible, translated from the original Hebrew and Greek, and with the former translations diligently compared, &c. when this is true only of the first editions of it.

But we do contend that these changes in the common version were, to a great extent, necessary; for unintelligible as many parts of it yet are, with all these changes, it would have been much more unintelligible if we had now to read it in the pure and unaltered style of King James.

The ignorant and interested have always made a great noise about changes: for, with them, if an *n* was upside down in the book their fathers read, it would be a sin to place it right. But while all intelligent, candid, and learned men will deprecate frequent changes in the Book of Books, they will vote for changes when time has rendered them absolutely necessary.

All translators have found it necessary often to compare and revise their own labors. Dr. George Campbell kept his admirable work lying by him between 20 and 30 years, and was constantly making alterations and improvements in it; and observes that if he had kept it longer, he should likely have still farther improved it. Martin Luther devoted many years to changes and alterations in his own version. Before his time there had been published at Nuremburg versions of a very homely kind, in 1477, 1483, and in 1490; and at Augsburg in 1518. He published the whole New Testament in September, 1522. Soon after the appearance of this version the clergy attacked it with great virulence. The common people read it gladly. But every sort of bad motive was imputed to Luther, and the version decried as full of errors and heresies by those who were on the side of the reigning hierarchy. One Jerome Emser published a critical review of it, and much in the spirit and style of Dr. Cleland. He found no less than fourteen hundred heresies and falsehoods in it. Cochleus, equally hostile, but less presumptuous, exhibited only one thousand misrepresentations in it. Duke George bought up the copies of this translation, and inflicted punishment on those of his subjects who ventured to retain them.

Luther made numerous alterations and improvements in his version. He was accused of always changing and new-modifying it; but in defiance of the calumnies of his opponents, he still persisted to issue one amended version after another. He gave one amended version in 1534; another in 1541; another in 1545.* It has, with few amendments, continued to be read to the present time, and was the most powerful instrument in forwarding the Reformation.

Changes and emendations have been the fortune of every translation of note. Even William Tyndal's Testament, of 1526, was amended by himself in 1534, and again in 1536.

The Geneva Bible, accomplished by the exiles at Geneva—namely, Coverdale, Goodman, Gilby, Whittingham, Sampson, Cole, Knox, Bodleigh, and Pullain, and printed in 1557, the first ever printed with numerical verses, (of which we have now before us two copies,) underwent its full share of changes and amendments. It was, however, very popular in England amongst the Protestants, and underwent about thirty editions in one reign. It was for a time proscribed by Archbishop Parker; but after his death, in 1576, it was read by authority.

That the reader may have a specimen of this version, and understand practically what we mean by alterations and amendments in style, while the sense is the same, I will transcribe a few passages:—

* *See Bowers' Life of Luther, p.* 196, 199, 254.

"*The Bible, translated according to the Ebrew and Greeke, and compared with the best translations in diverse languages*, &c. *Imprinted at London, by* Robert Bakker, *Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majestie.* 1607."

Titus iii. 4, 5.—But when the bountifulnesse and love of God our Saviour appeared. Not by the works of righteousnesse which wee had done, but according to his mercie he saved us by the washing of the new birth and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

1 *Peter* iii. 21.—Eight souls were saved in the water. To the which also the figure that now saveth us, *even* baptism *agreeth* (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but in that a good conscience maketh request to God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Acts ii. 38.—Then Peter sayed unto them, Amend your lives, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sinnes, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Rom. vi. 4.—We are buried then with him by baptism into his death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so wee also should walke in newnesse of life.

Heb. vii. 24.—But this man, because he endureth ever, hath an everlasting priesthood.

Heb. viii. 7.—For if that first testament had been faultlesse, no place should have been sought for the second.

"*The Bible, translated according to the Ebrew and Greeke, and compared with the best translations in diverse languages*, &c. *Imprinted at London, by* Robert Bakker, *Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majestie.* 1615."

Titus iii. 4. 5.—But when that bountifulnesse and that love of God our Saviour toward man appeared. Not by the works of righteousnesse which we had done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of the new birth and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

1 *Peter* iii. 21.—Eight soules were saved in the water. Whereof the baptism *that* now *is*, answering that figure (*which* is not a putting away of the filth of the flesh, but a confident demanding which a good conscience maketh to God) saveth us also by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Acts ii. 38.—Then Peter said unto them, Amend your lives and bee baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sinnes, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Rom. vi. 4.—Wee are buried then with him by baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead to the glory of the Father, so wee also should walke in newnesse of life.

Heb. vii. 24.—But this man, because hee endureth ever, hath a priesthood which cannot pass from one to another.

Heb. viii. 7.—For if that first testament had been unblameable, no place should have been sought for the second.

Such is a mere specimen of the changes and improvements made in eight years in the Geneva Bible—a version the conjoint labors of nine persons. Had they lived to this time, and advanced as far in every 8 years as in those, we should likely now have needed no other version than that of these nine good Calvinists, amended and improved thirty-four times in 276 years.

I am the more particular in the history of this version, as it belongs, by descent, to Dr. Cleland and his brothers, rather than to me; and when next he talks of changes, alterations, and amendments, let him remember the pit from which he was dug up; and if he continue to inveigh against our labors and to impeach our motives, let him re-

member that every blow he strikes at us breaks the head of his great grand father before it can break our skin.

But they were Paidobaptists, and never thought of translating *baptizo;* and therefore all their labors are of the nature of emendations, but ours are of the nature of corruptions of the text! This is the fatness of Dr. Cleland's argument. It is his love for the bare element of water, without regard to quantity, which hides all the sins of his forefathers in their changing and new-modifying the sacred text. Mr. Cleland goes for the mere element of water, and therefore to him a drop of dew will answer all the purposes of the Pacific Ocean. But in our next we shall attend to his capital objection to the new version. EDITOR.

Letter from Charles Cassedy, Esq.

No. III.

LIVINGSTON, BEDFORD COUNTY, TENNESSEE, August 28, 1833.

Respected Sir,

I HAVE received number 7, vol. 4, of the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER, containing the publication of my second letter to you, on the subject of the merits of the debate between Mr. *Robert Owen* and yourself; and also embracing some other matters, connected with what I am compelled reluctantly to believe, touching the wishes of some of the *sectarian churches* to interfere with the legislative and political concerns of the Republic. In noticing the above subjects, in the manner I have done in my last communication, I was actuated by a spirit of impartiality and candor, as *fearless* as my consciousness of justice and rectitude of intention; believing, as I certainly do, that the *religious*, *moral*, and *political* interests and prosperity of mankind, require a prompt and decided rejection of Mr. Owen's *theory of religion*, as well as of all the *theories of politics* entertained by the sectarian Doctors of the churches, as connected with their theological professions. I have been informed (whether correctly or otherwise I am unable to say) that, in addition to the late attempt to influence Congress to pass a law for *stopping the mails on Sunday*, some of the sectarian theological journals, in the plenitude of their zeal for the propagation of their doctrines, and the *triumph* of their churches over the political energies of the nation, have openly boasted that they already possessed the *wealth* and *numbers*, and would shortly possess the POWER to compel Congress to do as they pleased! I trust, sir, for the sake of religion and humanity, and for the sake of our unrivalled political institutions, which guaranty perfect freedom and toleration to all religious denominations, that this imputation of ambition for secular power and dominion, on the part of any religious denomination, may be wholly unfounded. Undue and compulsory influence, from whatever source derived, or with whatever *motives* exercised over those who are entitled to the high prerogative of self-government, is absolute and uncondi-

tional tyranny: and of all *usurpations* ever yet exercised over the human race, as is evidenced by those of the Church of Rome, ECCLESIASTICAL DESPOTISM is most to be dreaded by mankind.

If religion involves the high responsibility of *man* to his MAKER; if it implies a reference of *the deeds of men* to the lofty and unerring tribunal of Heaven for decision; and if it presupposes, as I think it must, that the Almighty is fully competent to executing those laws which he himself, in the infinity of his wisdom, imposed on the universe at the creation; I cannot conceive, sir, by virtue of what scriptural or other authority, these *secularly ambitious sectarians* presume to interfere between man and his Creator, or to desire the ultimate *triumph of their contradictory and disputatious creeds*, by the obliquitous, and too frequently iniquitous co-operation of merely human institutions. Were the government to grant them all they seem to desire, which the political constitutions of the union, and the enlightened liberality and forecast of the American community, will always continue to *veto* in tones of thunder,—I am something at a loss to distinguish with precision, what use they would make of their *politically theological* power. Would they establish a NATIONAL CHURCH, and enforce the collection of taxes (*tithes*) for the support of this LEVIATHAN of their holy and misdirected zeal? Would they trammel the consciences of our citizens, and as far as *legislative influence* might be made to extend, compel them to attend their popular congregatings, and conform to their external rites and ceremonies? Can they possibly conceive, that the *human mind* may be *forced* into the belief and adoption of any theological creed, and compelled to direct itself heavenward by the anathemas of the church, or the energies of municipal law? If they entertain opinions or hopes such as these, they certainly neglected to contemplate the numerous *martyrdoms* suffered in the early ages, for the establishment of the facts and doctrines which constitute the APOSTOLIC BASIS of their own creeds: they have yet to learn, that although man may sometimes be made a *hypocrite*, he can never be made a *true believer*, by compulsory or even painful and cruel measures, as is demonstrated by the whole history of the *Inquisition;* and they have yet to distinguish, that *intellectual freedom* is the element of TRUTH, the true parent of mental, moral, and *religious* enjoyment—and, in fine, that however the human physical system may be subjected to the coercive, and even painful inflictions of municipal or ecclesiastical tyranny, yet that the human SOUL is naturally and essentially free, and always will, under the most painful and excruciating circumstances, exult in its sentiments of unrestrained, and even unbounded LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE!

The human mind, in this enlightened age, has attained too great a pitch of elevation, strength, and improvement, to be coerced in its progressive energies by the mere cobwebs of sublunary power; within the *last hundred years* it has received an irresistible impulse to the fulfilment of its HIGH DESTINIES, which must forever bid defiance to the comparatively feeble efforts of human despotism to restrain its course; and, all attempts to bind it to the servile observance of either *political*

or *religious* creeds, unsanctioned by the free and conscientious exercise of its own powers, would be as ridiculous, futile, and absurd, as would be human efforts to change the laws of nature, or to coerce and give direction to the winds of heaven! This improvement in intellectual elevation and moral energy, has not been the preternatural and miraculous growth of an hour, like the gourd of Jonah, or even of a single age: it has been the offspring of causes, which have been in progressive and silent operation for a long lapse of preceding ages; and the momentum of its influence on the whole human race, in spite of ignorance, fanaticism, sectarian zeal, and *religious* as well as *political* despotism, will not and cannot be diminished, if the *art of printing* continues to be known and practised, to the end of time. Human degeneracy can never spring from *solid acquisitions* of intellectual power; these acquisitions are as essential to the spread of vital and *unadulterated religion*, as they are to the growth of *moral virtue* and of *human happiness;* the degeneracy, and retrograde movements of mankind, in all ages, to a state of barbarism and degradation, have sprung from ignorance of their true interests, and the superstitions entailed on them by a barbarous and unenlightened ancestry. But the scene is now changed; mental improvement, and moral elevation of character, through the instrumentality of the *art of printing*, which can nearly multiply to *infinity*, and almost perpetuate to *eternity*, transcriptive records of all the useful discoveries of science, are now effectuating a permanent moral revolution in the destinies of mankind. The ancient frauds, and mystical influences of superstition, will sink before these progressive illuminations of the human mind: genuine and UNADULTERATED RELIGION will not only have nothing to apprehend from them, but will be sustained in its purity and influence, by their sublime, tolerant, and comprehensive energies; *hypocrisy*, which is the religion of knaves; *fanaticism*, which is the religion of madmen; *fear*, which is the religion of imbecility and cowardice; *superstition*, which is the religion of fools; and *ecclesiastical despotism*, which is the religion of TYRANTS, alone will suffer in the ordeal of intellectual elevation and improvement. Man is becoming a *reasoning*, if not as yet a *very reasonable* being; he is gradually emancipating himself from the servile yoke of his passions, elevating himself to true intellectual dignity, asserting his real rank in the great scale of creation, and appealing from his *childish fears*, *vindictive bigotries*, and disgraceful and *absurd superstitions*, to the throne of REASON and GOOD SENSE, for testimonials of the *truth* or *error* of all creeds, mythological, theological, and secular, which are considered as connected with his prosperity and happiness. This is, in fact, the *age of danger* to all visionary and unsupported theories, *religious* and *political:* and it is not improbable that this view of the present and anticipated state of things, may have given rise to the late attempts to *overawe* Congress in the matter of *stopping the mails on Sunday*, as well as to the menace put forth, as I have understood, by some of the *sectarian* theological journals, that they "had the wealth and numbers, and would shortly possess the POWER to compel Congress to do as they pleased!"

And, sir, I have been thus particular in touching with a strong hand the above subjects, that I might exhibit a clear title to require, or if you prefer the phraseology, to *demand* from your candor, and better information touching all sectarian manoeuvres for the acquisition of power, authentic and public intelligence respecting the above menace, if indeed any such were made. The information I require is by no means unimportant to the people of the United States; very many of whom begin to suspect (and possibly on just grounds) that the late attempt to *stop the mails on Sunday*, was merely intended to test the popular power of SECTARIAN THEOLOGICAL AMBITION in Congress: and that, had this effort been successful, the next essay would have been to establish, *by law*, a NATIONAL RELIGIOUS CREED!

I am perfectly aware of the delicate predicament in which I place you, in making this requisition for correct information; I know that many (if not all) of the sectarian professors are your enemies; and, that any replication you may vouchsafe, however characterized by mildness, candor, and elevated integrity of purpose, will be construed by those who have lavished on you much personal abuse, into malignity of temper and motive. I trust, however, that your moral firmness, and strong sense of public duty and justice, will lead you to disregard defamatory consequences in the cause of truth: and that you will bear in mind the ancient and valuable maxim, "Justice is the queen of virtues."

With great and sincere respect,
I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,

CHARLES CASSEDY.

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, *Bethany, Va.*

REPLY TO CHARLES CASSEDY, Esq.—*No. III.*

Respected Sir,

THE Prince of Peace, when he made his good confession in the presence of Pontius Pilate, the Roman Procurator, explicitly avowed that his kingdom was not *of* this world, though he has a kingdom *in* it. Unfortunately, in the blinded zeal of many of his professed adherents, numerous and daring attempts have been made to falsify, or at best to nullify, this unequivocal declaration. During the long dark night of the Catholic ascendency, the standing order of every day, for more than a thousand years, was, to bring the whole world into the church by the potency of infant dedication. So far as the arguments of the Roman Pontiffs prevailed, every thing born of woman was carried *nolens volens* into the church. All infants were christened in the very act of receiving their names. Thus the doors of the church were made as wide as the gates of life, and all the children *of the world* were made members of the church. By this stratagem the landmarks of the kingdom of the Messiah—the kingdom of righteousness, purity, peace, and joy, were defaced; and wherever the sword of the civil magistrate extended its jurisdiction, the benedictions and maledictions of the "Holy Father," Christ's Vicar, were regarded with religious veneration. For more than a thousand years it was all church, and no world. Then, indeed, if the Roman Catholic church was Christ's kingdom, it was a kingdom *of this world.*

But, sir, we can find on the faithful page of history* a church that never worshipped the Pope as Christ's Vicar, and that always witnessed, though often in sackcloth and ashes, that the Messiah's kingdom was not of this world. Our ancestors, however, were reformed Papists; and these United States having been nursed in British cradles, were set up on the maxims of English Puritans, Scotch Presbyterians, with some traditions from the church of Saint Harry. Lutherans and Calvinists our progenitors were; and while they laid with great violence the axe to the root of the Papal tree, they never thought of that germ of carnality, infant church membership, but nourished and cherished it with the greatest solicitude. Hence those *natural* Christians, those *carnal* spirituals, born after the flesh, being a majority, soon dressed up their bastard Christianity in all the attire of worldly glory: and if their bantling was not treated with courtly respect, they grasped the sword, after the manner of their old mother, and filled the incredulous with fear and trembling.

By a *jure divino* sort of argument the King and the Priest were equally the Lord's anointed; and forming a copartnery for better and for worse, they faithfully managed the affairs of both worlds by a standing army of Lords spiritual and temporal—by a pensioned priesthood of secular regulars and regular seculars—of spiritual ecclesiastics and ecclesiastic spirituals—until all things worked together for the good of the King and the Bishop.

In the days of King James the chorus to every orthodox song in the High Church Psalter, was, "*No Bishop, no King;*" and our good puritanical fathers, fascinated by these pious melodies, ostensibly got up an image of the beast, and would, in their philanthropy, have all men honor it, as their fathors honored its great prototype at Rome.

Our pious forefathers hated persecution while they were its unfortunate victims; but so soon as their wounds were healed under the genial influences of an American sun, they thought of erecting to themselves temples and tribunals after the manner of England and Scotland, of France and Italy, only without that imp of horror, a Lord Inquisitor. A few lashes, indeed, at least skin deep, they thought might be good for the soul, and accordingly they made for themselves a few scourges for the spiritual good of their much beloved neighbors and brethren, the Quakers and Baptists; thus showing, that, in their judgment, a few gentle strokes, dealt out by *Protestant* hands, could have no bad effect when judiciously administered to bodies not their own.

The sages of the Revolution, admonished by these instructive hints, took special care to keep the civil government out of the church, and thus to remind the preachers that their Master's kingdom was not of this world. They have learned this lesson with a very bad grace; for to this day they will not yield to the civil magistrate the right to teach them. They have, indeed, to subscribe the popular creed, and say, No union between the church and state; but occasionally they too much resemble the royalist, who, in drinking a toast to the Protector Cromwell, would, by a glance of his eye, show that Charles was in his heart.

Mindful of the flesh pots, the leeks and onions of Egypt, our Paidobaptist brethren, a vast majority of whom received their religion and their name by a few drops of water from the finger of a son of some old hierarchy, are praying for a time when the government shall be on their shoulders, and "kings shall again become nursing fathers and queens nursing mothers to the church."

But to come at once to the questions which you have so respectfully tendered—I am, from a memory disposed rather to forget historical events, especially when they are only to live within me as new monuments of human folly—unable to refer to the proper authority in attestation of some such saying as that which you have so precisely quoted. I could, indeed, name the man who could give full and authentic information on this head. But unfortunately he committed himself so far in his project to bring 500,000 religious and orthodox voters

**See Jones' History of the Church—a work that every Christian teacher and statesman ought to read at least twice.*

into the field, that his tongue is tied and his lips sealed on these projects. But as his chivalrous soul hazards the most daring enterprizes, I am not without some misgivings that the Rev. *Ezra Styles Eli* would own some such bold assertion respecting the future glory of Presbyterianism in these United States.

Such menaces, sir, I believe have been made, and I believe that the aforesaid gentleman's periodicals will afford as much light upon them as any other print in America.

If I mistake not, a motion was made in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, and actually carried so far as to return thanks, in the name of the church, to Congress for its decision of a certain matter. This I regarded then, and I was pleased to see that it was so regarded by a portion of that august body, as a jesuitical stroke of policy to gain power. For if the authority of the General Assembly is to be felt in Congress, in the way of benediction, it is to be presumed that it would soon expect to be felt in the way of malediction. Many a gallant steed has been saddled and bridled by the charms of a handful of salt, while the wary rider kept the bridle out of sight.

When I saw this vote of thanks going from Philadelphia to Washington, I thought of a fable in Esop, and saw in vision the salt in the left hand and the bridle in the right. But it was not courteously received; and I hope the good sense of the Assembly will hereafter mind its own business.

The word *nation*, sir, is a word of much pomp and splendor in these Republics. Our theologians all know how to make an *adjective* of it. We have got the *National* Preacher, Tract Society, Sunday School Union, and I cannot name how many *national* objects, religious and political, are in view. A *national church*, if we could only agree about what it ought to be, would be a glorious desideratum; and then *a tax to support it would not be amiss*. Did you ever, my dear sir, discover the policy of the General Assembly admitting into its deliberations commissioners every year from the Congregational Associations of *New England?* This union will always further the prospects of all the sons of hierarchy in the land; and should the happy day arrive that the old leaven will leaven the whole mass, the world will, in the bosom of the church, be astonished how gently it got into its kind embraces.

Such have been my lucubrations on all the passing incidents of the day, especially since the *no-Sunday mail* project commenced its career. A church of this world, controlling the literature of the country, and founding great theological and ecclesiastic establishments, boasting of wealth and learning, and gathering under its control all the children of the flesh, exhibits the boldest traits of the proudest hierarchies of the old world; and it would be a new thing under the sun if such an institution would not assume a menacing attitude when fast rising into power.

Indeed, the old and scriptural adage, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" has caused me long since to despair of any "Protestant" sect rising above its fountain. If the mother sect was a tyrant, the daughter will ape her temper; and when of mature age and reason, she will imitate her practice. The Catholic, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian in America, are the same as in Rome, England, and Scotland, only under the control of different circumstances. Assimilate the circumstances here to the circumstances there, and no law of nature will be more consistent with itself than the spirit of these sects. They would be on the throne here, as certainly as the smoke ascends upwards.

All that have once taken the sword, would take it again; for "all who take the sword must perish by the sword;" and they cannot perish by the sword, unless they take it. These are oracles of reason as well as of revelation. A King of France, tyrannical as he was, could be a *subject* in England when adverse fates drove him from his throne; but when fortune smiled on him, he could again resume his royal prerogative without a demur. I cannot, therefore, form a more favorable judgment of these American sects than their past history will authorize, and am necessarily jealous of all their movements.

In them are found many good citizens—men in whom the spirit of humanity rises above the spirit of the party: but as every creed has a soul as well as a

body, the spirit of these creeds is as necessarily proscriptive and tyrannical as instinct in a lion. The creed must be changed, and its spirit cast out, before I dare trust my civil liberties in the hands of the best members of any one of these three royal sects. Each of them has its children too; and, as nature never errs, the third generation is to be suspected as well as its progenitors. I fear the Episcopal Methodist as I do his Episcopalian mother.

But, sir, the *Sceptics* themselves are as sectarian as the religionists of our country; and while the tablet of my memory has inscribed upon it the deeds of the French Sceptics, I can give no preference to an Atheist above a Pope. I know them too well to trust in them even in an "age of reason." Any government will be mild and kind when all are of one opinion. Our community is mixed, and the wisdom of our institutions is, that, irrespective of sectarian *opinions*, men of moral worth are eligible to every office, and that our government knows no man according to his faith. This is all we can expect or wish in the present state of the world. Our duty, therefore, as citizens, is, to hand down to posterity the institutions of our country as we found them; and to direct the minds of our contemporaries to that great change which will soon astonish the world—when all the monarchies, republics, and hierarchies, sceptical and sectarian, shall be broken to pieces as a potter's vessel, by the iron rod of the Great King. For this glorious expectation I have a hundred reasons to offer. To submit a few of these to your consideration, would, at a more convenient time, afford me great satisfaction. Our government is eligible only in reference to the three degrees of comparison; for it falls immensely short of doing that honor to human nature, and of conferring those benefits on mankind, which right reason and true religion inculcate, with an eloquence more thrilling than ever fell on Grecian or Roman ear.

With sentiments of very high regard and esteem,
I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

EDITOR.

Methodistic Liberality.

OUR readers will remember an extract from the Christian Advocate and Zion's Herald, which appeared in No. 6 of the current volume. This document evinced a strong inclination on the part of the conductors of said journal to calumniate us under the charge of Unitarianism. We not only addressed to the editors of said journal our remarks upon their article, but also a previous number containing our reply to Elder Grew, showing how utterly foundationless were the imputations of these gentlemen. We wrote them also a note, complaining of their injustice, and asking for reparation; requesting at the same time, that, if they published the pieces referred to, or said any thing in reply concerning us, they would send us their paper, and we would exchange with them.

Report says they never published any communication from me, nor extract from the Harbinger, save some of the letters from Mr. Waterman; one of which I accidentally saw on my late tour through Ohio. One thing, however, we do know, that not one of their papers has ever reached our office. If they wish to compel us to subscribe for it, we now inform them that we will not. I believe no law or point of courtesy is more universally established, than the custom of authors and editors forwarding, without solicitation, to those whom they assail, copies of their works. But these gentlemen appear willing to receive ours, and send us nothing in return.

This is, however, a very small matter in comparison of what follows. They have actually refused to do me justice, and will not permit one of my pieces to reach the eyes of their readers through the medium of their columns. They do *falsely* accuse us, and actually refuse us, as far as in their power, the right of self-defence. I should have thought this beneath the dignity of any admirers

of John Wesley; and, indeed, had I not seen one of Mr. Waterman's letters copied out of the Harbinger, I would rather have inferred that my numbers had failed in reaching their destiny, than that they could at once violate the rules of courtesy and the sacred rights of justice.

I would complain of their publishing Mr. Waterman's letters without my replies, but these high-handed measures diminish my surprize on witnessing their pusilanimity and cowardice. But "the craft in danger" is an argument which at once overrules all the considerations of politeness, reason, and justice.

It is presumed that this notice of these champions of Methodism will bring upon my defenceless head a torrent of abuse in the aforesaid columns; but as I never expect to see it, I will escape all the grief which such conduct is wont to produce: for, according to the proverb, "What reaches not the eye, grieves not the heart." EDITOR.

Sectarian Liberality.

THE *Presbyterian* in Philadelphia, the *Christian Secretary* in Hartford, and some *Baptist Register* in New York, have in part walked in the footsteps of our Methodist friends of the Herald. Each of them has assailed us in its own way, and refused to publish in its own columns our replies—So that all the rights of courtesy are to be denied us heretics; for no other reason, 'we guess,' than that the ancient Christian institutions are more obnoxious to the reprobation of the modern Rabbis, than even the wildest fanaticism or the most brainless superstitions of their contemporaries. We cannot otherwise explain the singular course of these guides of public opinion: for they would rather publish a column from the Pope or a page from Voltaire, than a few paragraphs from the Harbinger. EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

GREECE, Monroe county N. Y. June 20, 1833.

HAVING been a constant reader of the Harbinger for two years, and observing the signs of the times and the agitation there is in the religious world, my eye is delighted and my heart is gladdened to see the march of truth—I mean, that the True Gospel is gaining the ascendancy over the modern gospels. I say *gospels*, for every sect seems to have one peculiar to itself.—I think, notwithstanding the opposition, that the prospects are, in this section of country, very flattering. Some seven or eight ministers (some of them under my immediate observation) have come out in favor of Reform. I think many of the Baptists have taken friend Powell's advice, to "fight Campbellism by letting it alone." SAMUEL CLARKE.

PAULETTE, Vt. July 4, 1833.

WE are progressing some, in this region, in the cause of truth; but our opposers are as active as ever, and the people mostly are ignorant of our real sentiments, and think, or affect to think, that the disciples and the Mormonites are the very same people:—and so long as they will neither hear, nor read, how can they be corrected? WERDEN P. REYNOLDS.

OOYEGELOGE, Cherokee Nation, July 5, 1833.

NOT long since, Mr. Pearson, the present Superintendent of the Methodist Missions in this Nation, demanded my parchments. He said he acted under the instructions of the Conference. After I obeyed the mandate, I was informed that if I had refused, a charge would have been preferred against me predicated upon my refusal!

How mysterious and unbecoming such manoeuvering! Alas for those in bondage to creeds, governments, and isms of human invention!

1. The Conference decreed that I was a suitable person to preach the gospel, read the Holy Scriptures in the church of God, solemnize the rites of Matrimony, and administer the Sacraments.

2. That in the year 1832 I should not be located, but left without an appointment.

3. That I should be stripped of all clerical authority.

What have I done to merit these decrees?———

1. I was immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

2. I published to the world, in the Harbinger, that I believed the Holy Scriptures to be the only divinely authorized and all-sufficient rule of Christian faith and practice, and that I could not in good conscience subscribe to those institutions of Methodism which I believed to be additions to primitive Christianity, &c. &c.

Now, do these things render me unworthy to proclaim the gospel, &c. &c.? Who can witness the ecclesiastical movements of the day, without almost involuntarily breathing forth the dying prayer of our blessed Saviour and the holy Stephen.

J. J. TROTT.

Cobourg, Canada, July 6, 1833.

I WILL now give you a short sketch of affairs in this Province. The cause of liberal, or ancient Christianity, has just got a little start in Canada. It has, thus far, been a hard struggle; but I am happy to say that now public opinion generally is in its favor. There are no churches nor preachers who particularly call themselves Reformers, or Disciples; they all take the name Christian, which I believe you acknowledge yourself. The most of the Christian preachers of my acquaintance are decidedly in favor of the principles you write upon, and ever have been since their conversion. We very much want an evangelist possessed of learning and talent sufficient to face the wisdom of the world, to travel through this province to advocate the principles of ancient Christianity. The preachers among us who are most capable of this task, are worn out already; and, as you yourself know that people generally are fond of new things, many would flock out to hear a stranger when they would not any one else.

There is a man among us from Rochester, by the name of Benj. Howard, who has been expelled from the Christian connexion, and now sometimes says he is a Reformer, Disciple, New Light, Christian, &c. He is a man of a bad character: and thinking probably you might have received, or may hereafter receive some letters from him, I thought it no more than a duty I owe to my Creator and his cause, to let you know, or put you under warning. I think his motive is to raise up a party. I will give you a sample of his career:—A man being considerably agitated concerning the baptism of his wife, fell into a fit, which he is quite subject to. Mr. Howard then stated that it was the power of God that struck him down because he opposed his wife; and further, he said he knew that it would take place, for God had told him so—for says he, "God tells me all that is going to happen."

I must now give you an account of a man of this place who has recently become convinced of the truth of the reforming principles. Last winter I spoke to him a number of times about the Harbinger, but never could get him to consent even to look at it; for, said he, I am sick of the writings of the world at the present day. A short time after, I presented him with one which I had just got from the post office. He then looked at it, and expressed a desire to read it. I left it, and he in consequence became so forcibly struck with its contents, that he has become a subscriber and is now using his influence in its favor, which is very great, he being the learned Editor of the *Cobourg Reformer*, a well conducted paper. He had been a Methodist preacher for a number of years before he left England, and some time in Canada. He has it in contemplation to publish a monthly periodical on reforming principles.

JAMES ASH, Jun.

MURFREESBOROUGH, Tenn. July 12, 1833.

I AM happy to tell you, that in our favored town the Living Word has effectually proven itself to be God's power to the salvation of many. The church of Christ in this place is composed of more than forty disciples, about fifteen of whom have been introduced into the kingdom by immersion since the first of March. A few weeks past, myself and brother Curbee took a tour as far as Alexandria and Statesville, about thirty miles from home. While gone, we had the inexpressible satisfaction of burying with our Lord fourteen intelligent persons; and about the same number (a part of whom had been raised vassals to a sect) professed emancipation, and rallied under the banner of our King.

T. FANNING.

LITTLE ROCK, Ark. July 26, 1833.

Brother Campbell,

I ASK permission through your paper to make a few remarks on the subject of Tracts. My reason for so doing, is, that I have recently found in the post-office several numbers of the Baptist Tract Magazine. It is about a year now since I left Presbyterianism, and was immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Since that time I have been engaged in teaching my brethren the plain import of God's word as it is found in the New Testament. How my name found its way to Philadelphia, I am at a loss to imagine. I suppose that some person has given information that I have renounced Presbyterianism, and the friends of Baptist tracts supposed that of course I would engage in the *good* cause under another banner. On the subject of *isms*, I have renounced them all; and as to tracts, I view them all in the same light. We hear a wailing from one end of the land to the other, as sore as that of Micah when the Danites had stolen his gods and priest. What is the matter? There is not a tract in every house—the voice of these silent preachers is not heard in every habitation! Surely the people will die for lack of knowledge! Societies are found with a progeny as numerous as the sons of Aaron, with Agents, Magazines, &c. &c. all of which is dubbed *the Lord's cause;* and to be found opposed to this cause, is a sin of the first magnitude, *and not to be forgiven in this life.* The Lord's cause must be a good cause; but it is yet to be shown that Tract Societies are his cause. The Lord's cause upon earth is the salvation of sinners. To effect this he has taken the most effectual plan; all his means are adapted to the end, and are of his own devising. The means are set forth in the New Testament; but in vain do we seek to find tracts even named in that book of divine instructions. The Lord carried on his cause in the days of Paul and Peter by the sword of truth, which is the sword of the Spirit; but in 1833 the word of truth is not sufficient—there must be something more. Paul was content to preach that Jesus died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he rose again on the third day according to the scriptures. But we must now-a-days have something more. Sinners will die in their sins if they do not read the Dairyman's Daughter, Cottager's Wife, Shepherd of Salisbury Plains, &c. &c. The Lord, it would seem, has become hard beset in these days for means, when he must resort to lies (or fables) to carry on his cause. The old Mother of Harlots used to work miracles for the conversion of the heathen. I ask, where is the difference between a false miracle and a religious fiction? —Now it does seem to me that there is no difference between the two modes of doing the Lord's work. But the old apology may be, I suppose, resorted to—"The end sanctifies the means." If Paul and his coadjutors were here, do those tract-makers suppose that they would become Presidents, General Agents, &c. I will answer for them, and say, they would not. If Paul's preaching should prove to be as successful in our day as it was in the year 60, there would be more trash burnt than was burnt at Ephesus.

The Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, all have their Tracts and TractSocieties. Now if the Lord's cause consists in tracts, how does it come to pass that we see so much difference in those tracts? We are told that they are a means of *grace*, and that many have reformed their lives by reading tracts.

From reading my Bible I learn that nothing but *truth*, inspired truth, is sufficient for these things. Who will say that tracts are inspired truth, or even truth at all? Many of the most celebrated are fabrications. If they are inspired by the Spirit, I would ask whether the Spirit inspires the writer or the book after it is written? If the writers were under spiritual influence, it must be some other spirit than that Spirit by which Paul was assisted when he said, "I tell the truth in Christ; I lie not."

From the wailing and lamentation which we hear in the land, one might suppose that *Jesus* could not carry on his cause without tracts, and that Satan was in fair prospects of carrying off the inhabitants of the Mississippi Valley, soul and body, and could only be prevented by an inundation of Tracts and Sunday Schools from the East.

Such institutions as Tracts and Tract Societies may be of use, and no doubt they are; but not to the cause of pure Christianity. They doubtless answer the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian cause a valuable purpose, and may succeed in making many converts to their faith; but that is something else than the faith of the gospel.

Yours in love,

W. W. STEVENSON.

PIKE COUNTY, Mo. August 9, 1833.

I AGAIN lift my pen to communicate a few things concerning the progress of Christianity here. The congregation which was formed here last winter, numbering at that time 34, has increased since then to nearly double. We meet every first day to celebrate the death and sufferings of our Saviour by breaking the loaf, while the world and sectarians rather scoff and lightly view this manner of proceeding. We bless the Lord that he has ever made it our privilege weekly to celebrate the memorials of our dying Lord.

JAMES JEANS.

MONTICELLO, Ky. August 10, 1833.

THE cause of reform is still progressing; we seldom meet but additions are made to the household of faith; at this time the number of names together are about 170, who are, with few exceptions, praising God and giving thanks for so great salvation.

JONATHAN S. FRISBIE.

BRUCEVILLE, Ind. August 13, 1833.

IN April last I advised you of the progress the good word of the Lord had made amongst us. Since that time 8 or 10 were constituted from our body. They now number about 25; and our increase has been between 40 and 50. We are now nearly one hundred in number; and are all striving to walk in the commandments of the Lord blameless. Last evening four of my children returned from a four days meeting in Allison's Prairie, Illinois. They inform me that great attention and good order prevailed. Eighteen or twenty made the good confession; amongst whom I had the pleasure to hear one of my sons obeyed.

Brother Trimble preaches near the Wabash. The labors of this worthy brother are greatly blessed. He has immersed more than one hundred since he has been riding amongst us. Persecution rages; but "truth is mighty, and will prevail."

Yours in hope of immortal life,

WILLIAM BRUCE.

NICHOLASVILLE, Ky. August 13, 1833.

THE cause of reformation is rapidly progressing here and elsewhere in Kentucky. Since the first of June brother Morton and myself have immersed about 75 persons; brother Thomas Smith, about 40 in the adjoining county; brother John Smith, about 300 in the neighborhood of Mount Sterling; besides many others who have been immersed by other brethren around him.

Brethren Stone, J. T. Johnston, and J. Creath, Jun. have immersed in George Town, Scott county, and Fayette, about 350, or more; besides others immersed by other brethren. So far as I am able to learn, I would say, there have been not less than 1000 persons immersed during the last two months in a few counties around us. More seriousness than usual is apparent, and the god of this world (with many) has in a great degree lost his bewitching influence. It is high time that *men* and *women* be honest.

But you and our friends abroad will ask, Does the opposition on the part of the sects around us give way? No—far from it; but waxes worse and worse; all of which we look for. Since my observation of the religious world, I have never seen so much prejudice and so much union by the religious sectaries. It has been a common idea with many, that we destroy all union wherever we go; but this is a great error. No; we bind the sects more and more together. The *Old Baptists*, *Methodists*, and *Presbyterians* have joined their opposition, and are making a common cause against the reformation. Yes, they say, 'Come over and help us against this common enemy.' Hence they preach together and for one another; to all of which I give my warmest consent; for the force of Bible truth will require the heads and efforts of all to withstand it.

But I must make some observations in relation to a circumstance which occurred at Mount Pleasant Meeting House in this county, where Edmund Waller has a large congregation. On the 10th and 11th instant, the brethren, who a short time since (say the 15th of May) organized themselves together as a church of Christ, upon the word of truth only, met according to their standing appointment, at that place to worship. The law of our Legislature gives a positive right to those who may dissent from any church, to use the house in proportion to their numbers; but this privilege has been constantly denied. We have therefore met in the yard of the meeting house lot. On Saturday the brethren hawled two waggon loads of plank and seats to the lot, in order to make the friends who might attend comfortable. We occupied them on Saturday—but, behold! when we came together on Lord's day morning to worship, we found every bench and plank burnt to ashes!! What a spirit of *burning* these is about this old Regular Baptist orthodox establishment! *Edmund Waller** burnt the New Testament because of his holy indignation against new translations; and his Mount *Pleasant* brethren, or some imbibing their spirit, have burnt the planks and benches to vent their spleen and holy indignation against the presumption of those who would dare be seated there in order to hear for themselves, "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." But the old saying is true—"Like Priest, like People." The pupils will always imbibe the spirit of their master or teacher. Edmund burnt the book because he hated it; and those who burnt the benches acted upon the same principle—not because they hated the benches, but the people for whose use and comfort they were intended. It is not, however, my intention to apply the above remarks to all the members of Mount Pleasant church—no, far from it! I know some of them who despise such wicked and outrageous conduct; but "the leaders do cause my people to err." But we are very willing, if they are determined to be wicked, that the people shall see it.

Notwithstanding this catastrophe, I spoke upon the gospel proclamation to a large audience, who were seated in gigs and other carriages, on rails, rocks, cloaks, and many standing upon their feet. At the close of the worship I had the pleasure of seeing six persons knocking for the privilege of sharing the cross and shame of being found relying upon the one Lord, one faith, and one immersion. Well, let the wicked rage. As fire burnt the book, and the plank and benches, so fire will most assuredly burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire; but the wheat shall be preserved in the garner.

We number now at Mount Pleasant about 35 or 37 disciples. The church was organized with only 3 present. We expect nothing but opposition. We

* *We unintentionally substituted* George *for* Edmund *Waller, in our last number.*

are ready and prepared to meet it; but not by using the same weapons of defence. No! for one I am resolved to stand or fall upon the claims of the Bible alone, without any adjuncts.

GEORGE W. ELLEY.

Lexington, Ky. August 19, 1833.

THE ancient gospel in this region of country is successful beyond all calculation; yet not more so than it should be. Some individuals among our public teachers, have, within two months past, immersed from two to three hundred persons; and, strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that your unworthy brother and correspondent did recently, within the vicinity of the city of Lexington, immerse a number of persons for the remission of sins, and raised them up to walk in newness of life. This I was called upon by the brethren and sisters to do, and was not disobedient to the calls. The cause of reformation in this place is rather looking up. We have had lately a number of accessions to our congregation after immersion. We do not only labor to convert persons to the ancient and primitive gospel, but to the ancient mode of living, into which *our clergy* cannot enter, and without which we will have done but little more than our predecessors. As a congregation of disciples, we continue to live as at the beginning, regardless of the opposition of our clergymen.

WILLIAM POINDEXTER.

North Fork of Ten Mile Creek, }
Washington co. Pa. August 24, 1833. }

ALTHOUGH so near you, yet not having an opportunity of going to your place, I thought it good to write you a line concerning our affairs in the church to which I am attached. Our beginning and increase have been as follows:—My wife and I had been baptized some years ago. I procured a brother to visit us and proclaim the gospel on the 28th of October last. Three submitted to the government of the Lord; on the 3d of April last, seven; on the 9th of June, six; on the 30th of June, four; on the 11th of August, five; so that our total number now amounts to 29. Our Elders and Deacons are chosen, and we have resolved to follow the word of our Lord alone. It will certainly give you much joy to know that this church is planted in the neighborhood immediately north of Laughlinstown, Westmoreland county, Pa. We have had no visit from any other man, and none, except at the times above mentioned. My object in writing is to ask and encourage you to come or send to our assistance. We shall have a two or three days meeting, commencing on the 27th of September next. Do, if possible, come yourself, or send somebody else, and let the attention of our travelling brethren be turned to us.

WILLIAM LOUTHER, Jun.

Louisville, September 4, 1833.

THE good cause is progressing astonishingly here. Some thousands have been immersed according to the original mode, and the cause is still advancing. May the smiles of heaven be with you!

JOHN R. M'CALL.

Bruceville, Ind. September 7, 1833.

THE good work is still progressing with us. Brother Trimble has immersed not less than fifty since I last wrote you. A considerable part of them will unite with us at Bruceville. A few minutes ago I witnessed his baptizing four for the remission of their sins at our village. May the good word of the Lord prosper until all flesh may see his salvation!

WILLIAM BRUCE.

HOWARD, Centre county, Pa. September 7, 1833:

MANY, if they prove faithful, will bless God in the day of eternity, for the labors of brother Shepherd among them. He has been indefatigable in his efforts to move the veil that long obscured the Scriptures from the minds of the people in this section of country. The brethren can now see the holy oracles with their own eyes. There are several brethren who labor in the word and teaching in Bradford county.

After I returned from Bradford county, the next Lord's day I immersed three persons in Beech Creek; the following Lord's day I immersed one at Mill Hall, six miles below Beech Creek. He is the first in the place who has been immersed for the remission of sins. He stated to the congregation that he had been convinced that immersion was essential to baptism from reading Professor Stuart's remarks on baptism and its derivatives.

Last Saturday we commenced a three days meeting at Beech Creek. Brother Shepherd and several other brethren from Bradford county attended. On Lord's day three persons made the good confession, and were baptized; on Monday thirteen more were immersed for remission, making sixteen in all at that meeting. Such joy and gladness among brethren I have seldom witnessed. The most of those who were immersed are in the morning of life.

N. I. MITCHELL.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

Dear Sir—ON the 8th instant, on our way to Philadelphia, and on the 15th on our return, we had the pleasure of meeting with the brethren in Baltimore; and seldom have our spirits been more refreshed than on these occasions. The perfect simplicity which their meetings present, and the unaffected piety which appeared to pervade every person in the assembly, and the *solemn* manner in which every thing was done, is so much in character with the New Testament, that even a superficial observer must be struck with it. The main design of all the remarks made were to lead the congregation more to the Scriptures, and to the *obedience* of them—to hold in higher estimation correct *action*, than correct *thinking*—and the cultivation of love amongst themselves. When we add to this the particular attention paid to us during the other days of the week we remained there, and the desire manifested by them to know every thing about the progress of the Redeemer's cause in the West, we cannot help saying that we think their example worthy of imitation, and that we feel grateful also to our heavenly Father for calling a few to bear testimony to the truth in that city.

The church now consists of about 50 members, having, during the past year nearly doubled its numbers. They meet every Lord's day morning, at half past 10 o'clock, in a room over the Bazaar, in Harrison street, to break the loaf, &c.—at 3, for singing, prayer, and exhortation—and at candle lighting for preaching the word of life to their fellow-men. Some of the brethren are well gifted, and the church is amply edified by itself.

Yours in the hope of a glorious resurrection,

ISAAC W. TENER,
J. T. M'VAY.

September 23, 1833.

☞WE had the pleasure of a tour of twenty days through the Western Reserve, in Ohio, and met with the brethren at Warren, Aurora, Hudson, Wadsworth, and the intermediate places. The yearly meeting at Warren was well attended. Nearly a thousand disciples partook of the loaf on the Lord's day. The meeting house, though of the usual size, was too small for them. They, however, had the pleasure of sitting down upon the grass in the public square, and, in memory of him who fed thousands placed in similar order, joyfully partook of the memorials of his dying love.

At Wadsworth also a very large concourse of disciples assembled, and, in the presence of many spectators, commemorated the loving kindness of the

Lord. The evangelists on the Reserve generally attended these meetings, and from them we learned that the brethren generally were progressing in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that still there are additions made to the congregations from all sects, and from those who had become sceptical in all religious systems because of the sectarian wars and bickerings by which they are sustained.

A want of system in the co-operation of the brethren is still more sensibly felt, and pains will be taken during the current year to remedy these defects. It was the expressed wish of the brethren present from many churches, that there be four annual meetings on the Reserve. There being 14 congregations in Trumbull and 16 in Portage county, the brethren in each county will have an annual meeting. That for Trumbull next year, at the usual time, at Howland. We have forgotten the place for Portage and the others; but will seek information and publish it in proper time. The brethren in the other counties of the Reserve will constitute two meetings. The particulars hereafter.

On our tour we had the pleasure of seeing more than forty persons introduced into the kingdom of the Messiah.

EDITOR.

Catholic Controversy.

WE have just read a pamphlet of 22 octavo pages, small type, containing a very able philippic against the Ismatic religions of Messrs. Hughes and Breckenridge, the celebrated disputants on the claims of the Pope and John Calvin. This pamphlet, from the pen of our much esteemed brother J. Thomas, M. D. presents a very lucid and forcible view of the true church of Christ and the Christian institutions, and exhibits in bold relief the real merits of the Papal and Protestant controversy. It is a document worthy of a very general circulation for its own sake, and is a striking proof of the irradiating, emancipating, and emboldening influence of the Original Gospel and order of things on the minds of all who cordially embrace the Apostles' doctrine.—Brother Thomas is but an infant of one year old in the Christian church; and here we find him, in the very temple of Apostate Christianity, successfully grappling with the Doctors of the two great parties in the apostacy: and certainly while contending with them, he proves himself, when panoplied with the armor of light, more than a match for the rulers of the darkness of this world, with all their Holy Orders and traditions of the See of Papal Rome.

Receiving the pamphlet yesterday, we have only given it a cursory reading and have not room to do more than give its title, and the introductory address of its author to the citizens of Philadelphia. ED.

"New Catholic Controversy.—A Mirror for Ismatic Religions, in a Letter addressed to Messrs Hughes and Breckenridge, showing that neither Romanism nor Protestantism is the Religion of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. By a Royal Priest of God's Heritage.

PHILADELPHIANS!

The time is at length come, when silence is sinful, and forbearance ceases to be a virtue. Shall we, the citizens of Messiah's kingdom, calmly witness the immolation of the eternal truth of the God of Heaven, so gloriously revealed by the Saviour of the world and his Ambassadors, on the altar of partyism, and not raise the shout of war on the battlements of Zion! Where are the watchmen of the city? Have they not abandoned the defences, forsaken her bulwarks, and ignominously sounded retreat? "*The present crisis*" is fraught with events which some affect to "*deprecate as injurious to the cause of religion;*" and gloomy are the forebodings of those who usurp to themselves the character of your spiritual guides. Controversy is to be hushed into the stillness of death, and the "more useful information" of the "revival"

of religious *sensations*, and implicit faith in "*our* Zion," are "to supply its place"! "*Contend earnestly*," says Jude—"Contend *not at all*," say religious editors: "*Combat the good combat*," says Paul—"It is non-essential," say divines: "Wield the sword of the Spirit," says the Christian warrior, "and wrestle with the rulers of darkness"—"Let them alone," says spiritual imbecility, "for controversy is fatal to the cause of religion"!

Such, my readers, appear to be the tactics of the day. A good cause never fears the light. The more the truth is controverted, the more brilliant its polish; but error hates the light, it fears inspection, it denounces disputation. In laying before you the following pages, I am actuated solely by a love of the truth, and a mortal enmity to corruption. I expect to derive no profit, I rather calculate on loss; not so much in a pecuniary sense, as in a fair reputation with those whose *worldly* weal is implicated in the upholding of religious systems. It is the apostacy foretold by the Apostles, against which I direct my efforts, not against them who are unfortunately its victims.

Protestantism is unquestionably defeated by Romanism;—its champions cannot prove its identity with the religion of Christ. Romanism, however, is not the less gross. I have been anxious, therefore, to call the attention of the public to the true religion, lest they should rashly conclude, that because these two isms of the "Christian *world*" are false, there remains none that is true. God brings good out of evil, and thus he overrules the wars of sect against sect, to the destruction of both. The religion of Messiah courts discussion, but ismatic religion dreads it.

In conclusion, I have only to add, that the faith, order, and institutions of the Holy Catholic Congregation of Christ, as described in this letter, are proclaimed, both in faith and practice, at the Bank street Meeting, where all who feel themselves weary and heaven laden by the oppression and bondage of sin and Satan, may be instructed in the way of truth more perfectly, and find an assurance of the remission of sins.

JOHN THOMAS, M. D.
95 North Third Street.

"Human Bones for Manure; and the End of Human Glory."

AN article with the above appropriate title is going the round of newspapers. The neighborhood of Leipsic, Austerlitz, Waterloo, and other places where, during the bloody wars of Napoleon, the principal battles were fought, have been swept, it is said, alike of the bones of the hero and the horse which he rode. Thus collected, they have been shipped to the port of Hull, (England,) and thence forwarded to the Yorkshire grinders, who have erected steam engines and powerful machinery for the purpose of reducing them to a granulary state.

In this condition they are sent chiefly to Doncaster, one of the largest agricultural markets in that part of the country, and there sold to the farmers to manure their lands. The oily substance gradually evolving as the bones calcine, makes a more substantial manure than almost any other substance, particularly the human bones. It is now ascertained beyond a doubt, by actual experiment upon an extensive scale, that a dead soldier is a most valuable article of commerce; and for aught we know to the contrary, the good farmers of Yorkshire are, in a great measure, indebted to the bones of their children for their daily bread. It is certainly a singular fact, that Great Britain should have sent out such multitudes of soldiers to fight its battles upon the continent of Europe, and should then import their bones as an article of commerce to fatten their soil!" *Troy Press.*

Catacombs.

THE catacombs of Paris are supposed to be the largest in the world, exceeding in extent those of Rome, Naples, Malta, and even those of Thebes. The excavations extend beneath the whole of the southern half of the city, and under a small part of the northern division across the Seine. They are the quarries whence Paris was built; the stone is a soft calcareous aggregate, filled with organic remains, of which shells form the principal part.

Here are vast quantities of human bones collected from the different cemeteries of Paris since 1786, and arranged according to the receptacles from which they were taken. Nothing can be conceived more solemn and affecting, than a visit to these dreary abodes—this place of skulls. It is, as it were, Paris in the grave. Here lie the remains of millions of its once gay and busy people, ranged in their long home, and piled together without distinction of high or low, rich or poor, friend or enemy. One pile alone contains 2,400,000 human skulls, and the different heaps extend a mile in length. Here are chambers, and galleries connecting them, which are lined from the roof to the floor with bones. In whatever direction the eye turns, it rests on rows of skulls. How affecting the contrast between the solemn appearance of this "city of the dead," and the gaiety and dissipation of the city of the living, which is built over it! *Historical Atlas.*

The Jews.

THE powers of Europe are finding it to their advantage to restore the Jews to their former inheritance in Palestine. The Northern Nicholas and the Pacha of Egypt must be arrested in their course, and if possible, the Russians be prevented from obtaining a footing on the Bosphorus and Asia Minor, and in order to accomplish the extraordinary design, France and England have agreed to establish a free sovereignty in Palestine, like the one they have already succeeded in effecting in Greece. A fleet is to be sent to negotiate peaceably with the Egyptian Pacha or prosecute the intended enterprize by a declaration of war. The leading characters among the Jews of Europe, with Rothchild at their head, are favorable to the design, and we may soon expect to see Jerusalem and Judea no longer desolate, but peopled with the descendants of their primitive possessors. It has been left to the cabinets of Europe to re-people the home of promise, and build up the waste places of the Holy Land. From the banks of Jordan again the Hebrew host shall lift their songs of praise, and the mounts of Carmel and Lebanon, and the rich and pleasant fields of Engedi restored to their rich pristine excellence, shall blossom as the rose. So much for the interest of Europe.—*Balt. Visiter.*

☞A LETTER from Mr. *Waterman*, in reply to my appendix to a former letter, is received, and will appear in our next.

☞WE are about leaving home on a tour of a few months to the Eastward. We proceed to Richmond to attend the general meeting in that city, which is to take place on the 25th, 26th, and 27th October. We intend, after spending a few weeks in Virginia, to visit the cities of Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York. As we will have to edit this work from home for three months, some essays in our regular series will probably have to give place to our notices of matters and things connected with the actual condition of society as it may appear to us to require.

☞Business will be attended to in our office, in the filling of orders and in all other matters, as usual. EDITOR.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number X.——Volume IV.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. October, 1833.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

MY last argument, relative to the dissolution of the present Christian administration, will be drawn from Rev. xi. 7.—"*And when they shall have finished their testimony.*"

We will not, at this time, give an opinion respecting the *witnesses*, what they are; yet they most assuredly are an appendage of the present dispensation, of the present Christian religion; prophesying in sackcloth since the rise of the son of perdition, or antichrist. Now these very witnesses are to "*finish their testimony*," be they whom they may. Reader, there is something big with alarm lurking behind this very prediction, which our dosing clergy are overlooking.* Are the witnesses to finish their *testimony*, and the administration go on undisturbed without their aid? When it can be proved that they are a useless appendage of the present dispensation, then may the dispensation go on undisturbed, performing all its functions, and convert the world, after "they shall have finished their testimony." Compare this cessation of *testimony* with the "silence in heaven about the space of half an hour," and then remember that God's moral administration is called *heaven.*

*From the conduct of the clergy, taken in the aggregate, one might be led to conclude they were making preparation for the emergency, by calling the next most efficient substitute into service—*filthy lucre.*

These witnesses are to finish their testimony and to suffer martyrdom previous to the fall of Antichrist. I leave these things to the serious reflection of those who may read, and take into consideration the subject of Christ's second coming.

Our great object in what we have written has been, if possible, to arouse the attention of our readers, and induce them to examine the prophecies; to inquire into the future—the events which are fast approaching the world; to show the absurdity of the systems of the day, in applying all the alarming predictions to the close of time.

We have been trying to show that the drift, the concentrating point of prophecy, is not the close of time; but the fall of Antichrist—the coming of the Son of Man. We have been showing the insuperable difficulties, contradictions, or absurdities involved in almost the whole of the prophecies, if our teachers have not been rudely mistaken in their meaning.

We have been trying to show that the doctrine commonly preached from our pulpits relative to the dissolution of nature by fire, is unscriptural and unphilosophical; that the world is to be a theatre of action eternally—one of the "many mansions" spoken of in Scripture; that dispensations are alluded to in passages which have been applied to the close of time; that dispensations have closed—therefore, may close again; that none have been renovated—always dissolved; that none have lasted more than two thousand years.

Until these opinions can have a "thus saith the Lord" to their overthrowing—a demoralizing influence shown, resulting from their nature and tendency; a negative is dangerous in the extreme. Carnal reason and the philosophy of the day may gain a momentary triumph over these opinions as enthusiastic, and lose a crown of rejoicing when the King shall appear.

Inseparably connected with the doctrine relative to the dissolution of the present dispensation, and the introduction of a new, is that of Christ's second coming. "This subject deserves more profound attention than any other, except the personal remission of sins." As before observed, who may use one argument in favor of the dangerous negative? I can see no consideration worth a moment's reflection, or that which weighs an atom on one side of the question, while immensity presents itself on the other. The plaudit of the King of kings. It is impossible that any thing can be lost by believing the doctrine of Christ's second coming—much may be gained. By disbelieving, nothing can be gained—much may be lost.

If dispensations have been changed, they may again be changed. They do not change of themselves, nor by the hands of man. No, never. Man is never consulted relative to these matters. It is always the work of God. He alone can repeal or change the administration of his moral government on earth. And if there ever is a new dispensation granted the world, it will be nothing less than a positive, direct, and indubitable communication from the Ruler of the Universe.

Now, reader, one of two things is to take place—the present dispensation, shorn of all its strength, is to evangelize the world, (a

moral impossibility;) or a new dispensation given. I have before shown that the present cannot be renovated. No means on earth can bring or restore the administration back to primitive rectitude; it grows worse yearly in despite of all the efforts that can be made to heal. Vice knows no retrograde.

Is this divided intolerant Christianity—this corrupt and crippled dispenser of the gospel, to be the heritage of him who made his soul an offering for sin, in view of a pledge that the heathen should be given for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession? Is this the dispensation which has for ages past been governed by laws made and executed by blind infallibility—blind, erring, presumptuous man, underrating Heaven's high authority by legislating for God's moral government on earth—to be regenerated? Age, as well as human legislation, has contributed no little toward paralyzing the energies of the present administration. If age and human legislation have produced the incurable divisions and corruptions of the Christian world, can time and human legislation cure them? Contrary to all former precedent, this dispensation is to be restored to primitive perfection, or a new one granted the world. Now, judging from the former dealings of God toward the human family, which of these events may we look for? No instance on record of any administration committed to the hand of erring man, becoming pure, simple, and efficient, after becoming corrupted. Now if these things be so, there is a necessity, an imperious necessity for a change of dispensations to take place before millennial perfection can be expected. It is quite absurd to expect perfection, which holy writ warrants us to look for during Christ's universal reign, to rise out of the present dispensation.

As before observed, inseparably connected with the doctrine of a new dispensation, is that of the second coming of the Son of Man. Who but the Master can repeal or change the laws of his house? Who but the Author of the present dispensation can introduce a new one? These things are done upon sovereign principles. The wisdom or convenience of human legislators is not consulted. The constituted laws in the house of the Master must remain in full force until he comes. Any laws substituted for *his*, is a violation of his authority. Any rites or ceremonies, rules or regulations, creeds or disciplines, other than the positive code, the literal laws of the Master by his unequivocal delegates, are violations and substitutes, instead of the authority of the Lawgiver, and are adopted or followed at a hazard but few would venture upon did they rightly appreciate the worth of the sacred oracles, the character of the Lawgiver, or the dreadful reckoning which is soon to take place about these very things.

We will first consider the positive necessity for the Master's return, rising out of the circumstances into which his heritage is fallen. Second, examine some of the most pointed predictions on the subject.

First, there is a fair contract existing between the Master and the servants; rewards and penalties are fairly understood; conditions fairly entered into. The Master is bound to reward or punish; the

servant is bound to obey as long as the Master affords a rule of obedience suited to his nature or capacity. The Master, either in person or by unequivocal delegation, is bound to furnish this rule of obedience. Has he done this? Are his servants living in obedience to his laws?

Now, reader, look at the glorious effects of human laws and legislation in the church: divided, rent, torn, &c. feuds, broils, animosities, wars and blood. Instead of being one, according to the prayer of the Master, there are probably more than one hundred different communities, regulated and governed in as many different ways. All different—all rignt; crying, "Lo! here is Christ!" Different interests will produce hostilities as long as sun and moon endure. These laws, no better than their makers, are administered by a thousand artless hands, loose, rigid, mild or tyrannical—all erring—all infallible, and have produced universal discord—a heterogeneous mass of contradictions; all specially "called and sent" by the one supernatural operation of the one Holy Spirit, to promulge one hundred or more different gospels; a part getting to heaven by the dint of vociforation—another, by mute silence! One party, without respect to faith or morals, Heaven's law, or man's agency, will, or inclination, are making the whole human family proper subjects of God's *love*—of his plaudit, "Well done, good and faithful servant!" Another party preaching, actually *preaching* salvation possible only to a few "darlings of Providence, fond Fate's elect;" a number which cannot be added to, or diminished from.

These are but specimens of the endless diversities found throughout Christendom—the irreconcileable jargon in the house of the Master. What but his presence can put these things to rest?

I have already said much about names, distinctions, &c. The day is not far distant that will decide if they be such harmless things as many suppose. They at least cast indignity on the Author of the Christian religion, and form insuperable bars between God's people, and nothing but the presence of the King can obliterate them and gather in one the scattered fold—scattered in the dark and cloudy day.

Now if the laws of the Master be violated, or others substituted, which have thrown his house into confusion; if the confusion be great, beyond the control of his laws, beyond the reach of remedy; if the servants be at the head of the tumult, fanning up the flame, "beating the men servants," &c. usurping authority, forming different parties, marshalling under different names or banners the misguided household, slandering or prosecuting those who may differ from them, administering gall and wormwood instead of the cordials of life; if these things be so, if they be incurable, they imperiously demand the Master's presence.

The very climax of the Christian religion amounts to this, at least the test will be in the great day of accounts, "I was hungry, and ye gave me food; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was in

prison, and ye came unto me." Now, instead of relieving the distresses and wants of their fellow-creatures, nine-tenths of those called Christians are the procuring cause of nine-tenths of human misery. Instead of peace and good will to man, the religion palming itself on the world for that of Christ comes with a sword in one hand—a creed or cross in the other. Nine-tenths of Christendom, instead of being a house of prayer, is but little better than a den of thieves. Almost the whole system of the gospel is perverted, made void by something that human weakness, wickedness, or folly has substituted in its stead. These things are not said to the disparagement of the Christian religion; the want of the religion of the New Testament has been the procuring cause of these evils. The spirit that dictated the creeds, the spiritual laws for the house of Christ, has been the cause of all the martyrdoms which have taken place in Christendom. The spirit of Christ is all meekness, all submission. The spirit universally prevalent, among all parties, is that of domination, lording it over God's heritage. These things are peculiar to the man of sin, and will remain unsubdued until the return of the Son of Man.

Will you persuade me that it is not the son of perdition, the Antichrist long ago foretold, that seeks the reins of government, that is forever lurking in ambush against liberty of conscience—forever seeking some pretext to unite church and state. Let our spiritual guides answer the question, Why is it that none of the parties might be trusted at the helm of government half an age? Why is scepticism a safer deposit of power than the religionists of the day? The reason is obvious: a large portion of what we see palming itself on the world for the religion of Christ, is in fact some spurious religion in the garb of Christianity. And this spurious religion is forever seeking to govern, to legislate—aye, both in church and state. The laws of Christ are too mild, too simple in their nature; no penalties that man can apply; Antichrist has no use for them; he must have laws which can be brought to bear on earth, such as racks, dungeons, fires, excommunications, and the like, for the purpose of purging the church of Christ!

Now when it can be shown that divisions are harmless, that they will heal themselves, that a house divided against itself may stand; that the simple, pure, and holy law of Christ can be bettered by human legislation; that human authority can keep men to the right when the law of the eternal unerring God has failed; that the Bible is but a constitution, from which laws or inferences may be drawn; that servants may legislate for the household of their Master, although the constitution makes no provision for the like; that the *made laws*, although widely at opposites, are all reconcileable to the constitution; that from this wonderful constitution laws of all shapes, sizes, or color may emanate, to suit the whim, caprice, or convenience of the legislators, be they Catholic or Protestant, democratical or despotic, all equally suited with this wonderful, wonderful constitution—a moral chameleon, that the spiritual magicians can make suit any color, kind, or form of government or doctrine since sin first made its appearance

on earth. I say, until these things can be shown, the presence of the Master is positively necessary.

If the Bible (as some affirm) be only a constitution, it must of necessity be, because it could not be adapted to the various situations of mankind—that it only can embrace broad and general principles, having specialities to be appended. If that be the case, the Bible is notoriously deficient, not having made the least provision for after legislation. Constitutions always provide for legislation. Human wisdom cannot arrive at perfection but by experiment. Would infinite wisdom leave man to try a thousand experiments in his moral government? Moral government admits of no change—in every clime or soil it is the same. A man cannot be placed in a situation in which the Bible is not suited to his case. A wonderful book of laws, special or general!

If Bible law was generally adopted, Christians, perchance, might come to see eye to eye; perchance might unite, might become one; various identifications might be lost. This would not do the clergy. It would be a death blow to human legislation and clerical usurpation. Being governed by one law, would of necessity produce one interest, one feeling, one name, "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," one kingdom, one universal head.

If the Bible cannot govern the church, it must be deficient. If it can govern, it must be the best. It is as strong to govern as it is to prove a government. If it can govern, what an indignity is cast upon the Lawgiver to substitute human law in its stead. What an indignity, what a reproach on the name of the Master, that the ever-hallowed name *Christian* must be sanctified into endurance by some other appellation more sacred! If he have the power, he will avenge the reproach of his name—his laws. If he have the love which caused him to lay down his life for the institution called by his name. If he has promised, he will return to his heritage and rectify the otherwise incurable disorders.

Infidelity is on an alarming increase; what but the presence of the King of kings will check the mighty tide? Nothing has contributed more to the growth of Deism, than the divisions and intolerance of professed Christians—and these divisions gaining apace. Christianity is putting forth a crippled, enfeebled effort to evangelize the heathen world. These divided efforts, with an immense amount of filthy lucre to aid in the work, is making, perhaps, one convert yearly, out of every five hundred thousand heathen!! Yet the heathen, according to prophecy, is to be given for a possession. Nothing but the presence of the King can bring this about, or such missionaries as he once commissioned, with demonstration attending their footsteps.

It may be said that God will not bring about by miracle that which can be effected by means. What are means performing now-a-days? Perhaps one convert made yearly out of every five hundred thousand heathen! And these converts, for whom sea and land are compassed,

are perhaps no better than those made at home*—needing a reconversion before they are fit for the kingdom. Now is not miracle necessary when means fail? Is not the presence of the Master necessary if the heathen are to be given for a possession? Without miracle Christendom cannot be united—cannot be christianized. It needs to be evangelized itself before it can evangelize the world. "Physician, heal thyself."

Converting Power.

WELLSBURG, September 2, 1833.

Dear Sir,

HAVING a leisure moment, I send you a few remarks on your appendix to your last letter to me. You say you will notice some "minute matters detached from the main argument;" but you begin with what you say is "the pith and marrow of my argument in favor of some insignificant influence—without words or signs."

This argument, you say, is very candidly expressed in the following words: "The source of thought is unknown; therefore, a foreign agent may act on our minds through mediums unknown to us."

This, you say, is "all the proof I offer in favor of my *favorite* position," and ask me if I am not too good a logician to urge as an argument in favor of any affirmative proposition, its mere possibility.

And when did I offer such an argument? I alluded to a well known fact in the philosophy of mind—not to prove the *certainty* of such an agency being exercised as I contended for, but to show its possibility, which you in plain language have denied more than once. Will you dispute this *fact* with me? If so, let me know it, and we are at issue at once. No, sir, I am not such a "cabbage head" to borrow again the Jew's words to Voltaire, as you make me appear. I never supposed a thing *certain* because it is *possible*. After your illustration, you say, "Having disposed of all the evidence adduced in favor of your favorite position"—and did I offer no other evidence to show that God exercises what you call an *insignificant* agency out of the word. To say nothing of the quotation I gave you from Dr. Paley, which you treat with so much contempt, I offered a very *important* passage from a very *important* part of the word of God—"abandon us not to temptation." This I said *then*, and *now* say has no meaning if there is no influence given us by God out of the *word*. You,

*A late writer says, "One of the Missionaries himself wrote home a few years ago, that they had been compelled to discharge all their converts from the printing-office for fear they would corrupt the morals of the Pagan workmen," &c. "Should the missionary exertions be equally successful in the future, they would christianize the world in about 500,000 years, provided the population remains the same!" That missionary expenditures among the heathen was "about two million, two hundred and ninety-five thousand nine hundred and forty-four dollars per annum. This is the expense of converting 1280 heathen to the doctrine of the orthodox—about 1790 dollars each!"

Quere—How much filthy lucre would it require to convert the pagan world?

my dear sir, and all the Doctors in Christendom will never be able to explain it according to the rules of common sense interpretation, without making it speak a language contrary to your *theory*.

Having, in your way, disposed of all my argument, you notice what you call my raillery. Now, friend Campbell, whether you are more to blame for penning the unmeaning passage under consideration, or I for noticing it, I leave the reader to judge —perhaps we both stand in need of *special grace* from our readers. But as you have gravely undertaken to defend it, I will notice it again. The reader will please to observe that you are explaining, in the passage under consideration, the *manner* in which angels move us to action. This, you say, is by *assuming* the form of a man—of a thought—of a *word*.

You now say that, by the *form* of a thought, you meant a word, and you call in old Shakspeare to help you—a man whose character and works I cordially *dislike;* but in this matter I admit his authority is high. He says, language gives to thought "a local habitation;" that is, words are *signs* of thoughts in the language of a poet. Very well, but I could not have supposed you to have spoken even in this poetic way, and to have meant, by the form of a thought, a *word*—for you distinguish the form of a thought from a word.

Now if by the form of a thought you meant a word, what did you mean by the form of a word? for you distinguish them. But what diverted me was not the angel presenting to the mind the form of a thought—that is, a word; but the angel assuming the form of a thought; for an angel to present a word to the mind, and to *assume* the *form* of a word, are not the same things. If I say a man assumes the form of a horse or cow, I mean that he appears in their shape—that is not the same thing as to say a man presents to the mind of another the form of a horse or cow on canvass—as you make the painter draw the likeness of Abraham.

Now to illustrate your illustration—let us suppose a good or bad angel moving a man to action—say the angel mentioned in Daniel, supposed to have influenced Cyrus in letting the children of Israel return to their native land. Now the angel says that he was "withstood by the Prince of Persia three weeks." How many transfigurations Gabriel must have passed through in this time. Or we will take the case of the devil's tempting Judas—if the old fiend could move Judas in no other way to betray his Master by signs or words, or by "assuming the form of a thought"—how many changes of appearance he must have experienced before he finished the temptation, and how rapid the transitions from the form of one word into that of another—far more rapid than those of Milton's devil after he was cast out of heaven, until he appeared in the *form* of a toad at Eve's ear.

I think, friend Campbell, your mind must have been filled with classic recollections from old Ovid, or some other poet, when you penned this passage. Such things in poetry amuse us, but they are monstrous in philosophy. After this, I hope, however, you will not talk about my "mysterious agency."

I pass over, at *this time*, what you say of my reference to God communicating his will to his Son.

I have failed, you say, to convince you that there is a *radical* difference between the Arminian and the Calvinist, while they both agree that special aid is necessary to salvation. My praying Arminian and praying Calvinist, you say, "are out of your chapter"—they are "both believers;" but is every man who believes in the truth of the Christian religion converted? This I presume you will not say; for you insist on something besides simple belief. You believe men are converted by *immersion;* but Arminians believe that this change is effected by the Holy Spirit—and they pray for it. I have said that Arminians believe that by virtue of the remedial scheme of Christianity, all men have, *at all times*, power to believe; that is, to read the word of God, and believe it—that, the Calvinist denies that men can believe savingly, without a special *call;* and yet you say there is no difference between them. The *special grace* of the Arminian is another name for special call. Accept of an illustration: Two farmers have each a field to plough: the one believes and acknowledges that he can plough his field at any time; this power has been given him, he says, by his landlord; the other acknowledges the duty to plough his field, but says he cannot plough a furrow until a certain day of ploughing power, when his landlord must give him ploughing power. Are these two men the same in their opinions? or does it follow because God has given all men power to believe the Bible to be a revelation from Heaven, that they need no more special aid, is a simple belief that Christianity is true all that is necessary to salvation? But you say, that if I have him believing and praying without special aid—that he can get along pretty well without it—that is because a man has power to *feel* his wants, and ask for *aid*, he can get along without it. Is this the logic of Bethany? If it is, I am sure it was not the logic of Gethsemane. Our Master did not reason so. But, friend Campbell, if all the "converting power is in the word," will you tell me why a man, before he is converted, should ever pray? This is the absurdity of your "word"-converting system.

But you say, while with you all men have at *all* times power to believe, they do not all believe, or they do not all exert that power—"they want power to enable them to exert that power." These are your words, not mine. When did I say so, or make an Arminian say, that God must give him power to enable him to use the power he already has, or he cannot believe the gospel to be true? My words are, "that Arminians believe that all men always have power to believe." Arminians distinguish between a *power* and a will or disposition to exert power. A power, to be acted upon, they say with Dr. Reed, is no power. Power to believe, is the gift of God; but a disposition to exert it, after it is given, is our own—a thing under our control, for which we are accountable to God. I give you another illustration:—A was a beggar: he applies for charity to B. B says to him, 'You are needy indeed, sir, and I have a plenty to give; but I have no will or disposition to relieve your wants.' A turns to C, and

makes appeal. C kindly sympathizes with him in his suffering; but says, 'I have nothing to give; you see my nakedness; if I had the means I would relieve you with all my heart.' Would not A have very different feelings towards B from what he had towards C? C is excused because he has nothing to give; but B cannot be excused because he wants the will. This, Common Sense says, is under his own control. Accordingly our excellent discipline, when exhorting us to do good, says, that "we should trample under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils—that we are only to do good when our heart disposes to it;" evidently implying that our will is under our control, or that we have a power to will.

Now, whether you agree with the Arminian that this power was lost by the fall, and restored by Christ's mediation, or not, I presume you will agree with him that all men possess it; and in this you both differ from the Calvinist—I mean, the old school Calvinist—because he denies the freedom of the will. See Edwards and Calvin.

However, lest my homely illustration should fail in giving you and your readers a clear view of what I have always understood to be the difference between the old school Calvinist and the old school Arminian, I will give it to you in the words of the pious and ingenuous Vicar of Madley, the vindicator of Wesley and Arminianism:—"Consider once more the difference still remaining between us—from our mutual concessions it is evident we agree—1st. That the will is always free. 2d. That the will of men, considered as fallen in Adam, and unassisted by the *grace of God*, is only free to do evil—free to live in the element of sin, as the sea-fish is only free to live in salt water. And, 3d. That when he is free to good, free to choose life, he has this freedom from redeeming grace. But although we agree in these material points, the difference between us is still very considerable; for *we* assert that through the mediation promised to all mankind in Adam, God by his free grace restores to *all mankind a talent* (*of free will to good*) by which they are in a capacity of choosing life or death; that is, of acquitting themselves well or ill at their *option*, in their present state of trial. This *you* utterly deny (says Fletcher to Hill) maintaining that man is not in a state of *probation*, and that Christ died for none but the elect—none but they can ever have any degree of *saving grace;* that is, any will *free to good.* Hence you conclude that all the elect are in a state of *finished salvation*, and *necessarily, infallibly*, and *irresistibly* choose life; while all the reprobates are shut up in a state of finished damnation, and necessarily, infallibly, and irresistibly choose death; for, say your Divines, God has not decreed the infallible *end* without decreeing also the infallible *means* conducing to that end. Therefore, in the day of his irresistible power, the fortunate elect are absolutely made willing to believe and be saved, and the poor reprobates to disbelieve and be damned."

If this plain illustration of the difference between the Calvinist and the Arminian fails to convince you and your readers that there is a difference between the two systems, I shall despair of being able to

effect it. I will not say now what I said before *pleasantly*, that it is owing to your former *habits of association*. I hope you will not take that expression unkind, as I presume no more of you than you presume of our political fathers—the great Washington, with his cool judgment and honest heart; the philosophic Jefferson; the bold Adams; the eagle-eyed and subtle Madison; the comprehensive and statemanship minded Hamilton, and a host of others—among whom, perhaps, some may think, stands pre-eminently distinguished, the sage Franklin.

You will never make candid men, conversant with the controversy, believe that the Arminians and Calvinists, with their armies, have been fighting about shadows, words, signs, and forms of ideas. Mr. Sparks, a very good judge, for he believes neither system to be true, says, "We have seen that the doctrine of election is the key-stone of Calvinism. It was a great topic of discussion at the Synod of Dort, and we may perhaps say it was the sole cause of that Synod being convened. The growing heresy of Arminius consisted in asserting the *free will* of man, and the *free grace* of God, in opposition to the notion of an absolute predestination. In this heresy the Calvinists saw *the ruin of their whole fabric*. Hence the *five points* established by a vote of the Synod of Dort; which may all be resolved into the one point of *election*, for this is the beginning and the end, the form and the substance of all the others."

If ever there was a "*war*" in religion or politics about *things*, it is this very war; the Calvinists believe that Christ came to save but a part of the human family; the rest, he says, are passed by, "ordained to wrath for their sin—that is, for Adam's sin. God never did or will give them any power to believe." Now a plain common sense conclusion from this system is, that men are not to blame for their sins. This has always been urged with great force, and has never been answered by any Calvinist. It seems to have awakened the ire of the old gentleman, Calvin himself; and he vainly attempts to answer it in the following words:—"The reprobate (says Mr. Calvin) wishes to be excused from sinning, because he cannot avoid its necessity, especially since this necessity is laid upon them by the *ordination* of God;" [observe, reader, how merciful John answers this plain objection;] "but we deny this to be a just excuse, because the ordination of God, by which they complain, is guided by equity *unknown to us*, but indubitably certain." Here he builds his whole argument upon a thing which he acknowledges to be *unknown*, "but which is *indubitably certain;*" that is, a man may be certain of a thing because he knows nothing about, or because it appears *absurd*. Mr. Calvin, however, has another kind of logic, which he uses very freely: he calls the objections of his opponents "intolerable petulence," "audaciousness," "the murmurs of impiety," "malicious calumny." When it was urged that if the fate of men was fixed by a divine decree, they have no reason for solicitude about their conduct in life, he answers, "And truly this objection is not altogether destitute of truth; for there are many *swine* who bespatter the doctrine of predestination with their

impious blasphemies, and with this pretext elude all admonition." Thus he answers this plain common sense objection by calling the objector a *hog*, and his objection an *impudent falsehood*. We have often had more decent, but never better logic in favor of this most unreasonable system. But the old gentleman had stronger arguments than these, which he sometimes wielded, as poor Servetus can witness.

I thank you for your Extra on Regeneration. Many parts of it contain fine sentiments. I was much pleased with the part where you exhort the brethren to all the duties of *practical piety*. This is the kind of reform we want. But I was truly grieved when I met with the sentiments you express in page 376, and beg the privilege of addressing you at some future time my thoughts on the passage.

Yours in the gospel of our Lord,

J. A. WATERMAN.

REPLY.

MR. WATERMAN,

Dear Sir—WERE we to make every allusion, quotation, illustration and repartee in our correspondence the subject of discussion and special controversy, it would swell into a volume. Our readers would soon be lost, or they would lose us in a multitude of frivolous replications. You have replied to my appendix to a former letter with much formality; and made some of its items themes of new discussion.

To reply to all these would again call for a reply from you; and then another and another, until the grand topic of discussion would be wholly lost. I will, therefore, only glance at a few items in yours before me, and these are they on which you have laid the chief emphasis, and to which you have given the highest conspicuity.

You complain that I did not formally notice all the argument you gave for the *certainty* of some special aid, or of a power out of the word; and that I represented your proof as only going to show its *mere* possibility. Now as the mere possibility of such a power, or aid, is not the question at issue, I regarded that course as illogical. For admitting that I have, in my various remarks on converting power, said that I cannot conceive of a moral power out of the word; yet as you professed to show the certainty of such a power, I expected from you other proof than Dr. Paley and mere possibility.

But you have given positive proof, you say, of the certainty, and not possibility of such a power? And what is it? A petition in the prayer which Jesus taught his disciples—"Abandon us not to temptation"!!

Now, sir, if you suppose that whatever will prove that Christians are liable to temptation, will also prove that God exercises special special power out of the word in the conversion of sinners, you and I can no more reason together than could the builders of Babel go on with their work when God confounded their language.

This being the only scripture proof of the *certainty* of a power out of the word in converting sinners, which you have adduced, I have no more to say on this topic. "All the Doctors in Christendom," as you say, "will never be able to convince me" that what proves temptation out of the word and a power in Christians to withstand it, equally proves that God exerts a power out of the word in the conversion of sinners.

I feel no desire to make you a Calvinist, or to prove that your theory and that of John of Geneva are radically one. I only repeat, that while there are many differences in various parts of the theory, yet I cannot see that you clear yourself of a radical identity with the great reformer.

To change the technicalities of the two theories into a plain common sense style, I would express myself thus of the two systems, as it respects the point before us. And first of the Arminian:—

This system represents all mankind as placed in the same state by Adam the first, and on its principles of impartiality regards all mankind as placed in the same state by Adam the second. Hence the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit treat with perfect impartiality every son of Adam in all things connected with conversion. God does nothing more for A, who is saved, than for B, who is condemned, while in the state of nature, or until the former obeys the new economy.

Free grace and equal grace is the grace of Arminianism. Any power out of the word, called spiritual aid, or common grace, or what any one pleases, is perfectly and exactly equal. Those who obey the gospel, and those who reject it, are equally the subjects of Arminian favor, help, assistance, or the power out of the word. Now, as only a minority of those subjects of this power out of the word obey the gospel, and the majority disobey it, then some other reason or cause than this spiritual aid is the cause of conversion. Hence, abstractly considered, it is not converting power: for, of the multitude subjected to it, only a few are converted to God. Now if you make this power *special*, and suppose that without it the gospel would be inefficient, then you stand upon Calvinian ground.

Sovereign grace and special grace is the grace of Calvinism. That system teaches that the word is a dead letter; that there must be a special and effectual call, aid, or spiritual power, independent of the word, to make it effectual in any instance; that the sinner is so dead and powerless, that, without this special aid, he cannot savingly believe it. The Calvinist contends that God does something for A which he does not do for B, and that this something is the cause of his salvation. This power, *out of the word*, is the saving power, and therefore it supposes that elect infants, idiots, and even pagans may be regenerated by the Spirit, without hearing or understanding one word written in the book. With him common grace or common aid is no grace, no aid. The instant, then, my dear sir, you contend that God does something *special* for A, which he does not for B in the affair of his conversion, you stand on Calvinian ground.

If, then, you go for special aid out of the word, you are a Calvinist; if you say that this aid is common, then it is not converting aid, for but few of the subjects of it are converted, and these are drawn by the motives which the gospel presents; for when they have told what the Lord has done for them, they cannot name a truth, or promise, or threatening which influenced them, that is not quoted from what is written in the volume.

The dilemma, then, in which you are placed, is this: If you affirm that God does any thing out of the word for A, which he does not for B, then you are a Calvinist; and if you say that he does nothing for A more than for B, then the salvation of A is not to be ascribed to any power out of the word, but to something else, whatever we may please to call it.

But, as I have often said, either theory is to me (as far as respects conversion) wholly impotent. No theory can convert any person. I know no greater drones under heaven than those who are always boasting of their power to do every thing which God requires. I have seen Calvinists and Arminians, fighting with great warmth for their respective theories; but when the battle was over and peace proclaimed, they were equally lying upon their oars. The Calvinist would, but could not; and the Arminian could, but would not do what they were commanded.

A person may preach either theory to the day of judgment, and not once preach the gospel, unless philosophy and fact are two names for the same thing.

Allow me to remark, that while I contend for free agency and human responsibility, I cannot understand what you mean by a phrase on which you seem to build much in your wars with the Calvinists. You say, "The will is under our own control." Is not this equivalent to saying that *the will is under the control of the will?* And how much does this prove in the disquisition on free agency?

Friend Waterman, you do no honor to your own intellect, and no justice to me, while you affirm that I "believe that men are converted by *immersion*." Surely you have read my Extras in vain. I never said so. You would not say that men are converted by *praying;* yet you lay much stress upon praying in order to be converted. You would not say that men are converted by *hearing* or *reading*, yet you lay much stress upon these exercises. I lay much stress upon *immersion*, because Jesus said, "He that believes and is immersed shall be saved;" but I never said that men are converted *by* immersion.

But, my dear sir, there is one saying which opens to me the whole secret of your difficulties and objections, and gives me an insight into your mind of essential importance in directing my future correspondence with you. It is your question, "If all the converting power is in the word, will you tell we why a man, before he is converted, should ever pray? This is the absurdity of your *word* converting system." And let me ask you, friend Waterman, who of the twelve Apostles ever commanded an unconverted man to pray? Did any Christian teacher, sent by Jesus, ever say to an unconverted man, 'Pray for

faith—pray to be converted"? I am not so much surprised that you call the doctrine of David an absurdity, who said, "The law [or word] of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" or the word of Paul, who affirms that the Jewish "Scriptures are able to make a man wise to salvation" through the faith in Jesus—as to find you an advocate for the prayer of unbelief!

Is this too strong? I will tell you why I think it is not. *No man, since the resurrection of Jesus Christ, can be heard in heaven, who prays to God, unless he first acknowledge Jesus to be his Son, and "the way, the truth, and the life."* A person praying to God through Jesus Christ, without such a faith, without such an acknowledgment of the Messiah, is not found in the New Testament—he is the creature of the Apostacy—the workmanship of scholastic divinity—a perfect non-descript in the vocabulary of heaven. And, sir, this is my folly, or my heresy if you please, that I hold and teach it to be an insult to God and Christ for any one in his sins to ask God to change the economy of salvation to suit his ignorance and caprice; or, if you please, to ask God for any blessing which he refuses to accept in the way which God has proposed it.

Saul of Tarsus, the thief upon the cross, or ten thousand instances of this sort, could they be found, would not constitute an objection, nor even a difficulty, in this case. The time was that the blood of bulls and goats—that the altar and the priest—that Melchisedeck and Aaron—that time, and place, and circumstance were all necessary to acceptance with God.

Time was, that turning the face to the East, or towards the Temple of Solomon, was necessary. Time was, that Daniel opened his window and looked towards Jerusalem while he prayed. Time was, that all the ritual of Moses was necessary to acceptable worship. Time was, that Cornelius might offer up his prayers and his alms acceptably without the name of Jesus or faith in his blood. But, sir, that time is past. The gospel is now preached to Jew and Gentile, and Jesus is exalted a Prince and Saviour to give reformation and remission of sins, without blood, altar, or priest on earth; and no Prophet, Apostle, or Evangelist, since Jesus entered heaven, ever told Jew, Samaritan, or Gentile to pray to God before he acknowledged or confessed Jesus to be the Messiah. "We have an Advocate with the Father." Who? Those, and only those, who are voluntarily under Christ.

I only ask one question and you cannot misunderstand me. Would it have been acceptable to God for any Jew, after the erection of the Mosaic institution, to have worshipped as did the Patriarchs? or would it not have been offering an insult to God for any Jew, under Moses, to have asked God to have pardoned him without his attendance at the altar or upon the priest, or in the way which the law prescribed for remission? Would not such an effort on the part of a Jew be called rebellion?

For what, my friend, would you command a sinner to pray? "God hears not sinners," said one whom Jesus restored to his sight. Would you say, 'Pray that you may believe'? Then Paul affirms, "Without

faith it is impossible to please God: *for* he that comes to God must believe that he exists, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him." Would you say, 'Pray for the remission of your sins'? When did an Apostle say so to a sinner? Why not say with Peter to a convicted, to a penitent Jew, "Be immersed for the remission of your sins?" Why ask God to forgive in some other way than the appointed? Is not this virtually to say, 'I desire you, Lord, to forgive me while I continue disobedient, or in some other way than that which you have appointed'?

Far be it from me to oppose prayer—the prayer of faith. I will say to Christians, 'Pray always;' to one who has transgressed, 'Confess, and pray for pardon;' to one who has professed the faith and departed from it, I will say, 'Repent and pray;' but to one who has not acknowledged the Messiah, I will say, 'Believe on the Son of God, reform, and be immersed for the remission of your sins.' My reason is, that I have Christian authority for all this; and those who act otherwise have human philosophy for any other way they please.

This is the merit of the controversy; and the question is, Whether we shall obey God, our own philosophy, or that of other men? This is the absurdity of my system, as you please to call it. I confess I am just so credulous as to believe that God's way is the best; and I will add, that to me it appears the most rational. The order of things in this philosophy is, first, the testimony of God; then, faith in that testimony; then, repentance; then, baptism and prayer; then, peace, and hope, and joy, and love; then, all good works.

Thus you have brought me to the right place of beginning; and although I saw this before, I did not choose it till you led me to it. In preaching, then, we first declare the testimony of God—draw our arguments and motives to obedience from the word, accompanied by all the demonstrations of the Holy Spirit, sent down from heaven—then we exhort to obedience from all the promises and threatenings in the gospel—then immerse all the believing penitents, that they may enjoy the remission of their sins and the consolations of the Holy Spirit.

There is a proper beginning and a proper ending of every thing in nature and religion, and indeed in all the affairs of men. To begin right is essentially necessary to a right termination. This is no where more necessary than in preaching and teaching Christ. My wish is, that we may always begin at the beginning, and then, by continuing in the course prescribed, we shall end well.

Very sincerely, EDITOR.

Professor Stuart on the Mode of Baptism.

NO. V.

OUR Professor laments the zeal of many of his good Baptist brethren for their favorite *mode* of baptism. He makes very light, indeed, of the merits of any question about "*externals;*" and, mild as he is, he

uses more than once the term *zealot*, as peculiarly applicable to those who are very scrupulous about "the costume of the church." Now, without an effort on my part to show that some of his affectionate Baptist brethren might think, and even say, that this term *zealot* would apply with equal classic force and propriety to any one who writes a hundred pages to show that any mode of keeping the commands of God will be acceptable, provided they are kept at all; for that a person may be a zealot for *latitudinarianism* as well as for *exact obedience*—I say, without an attempt on my part to press this matter upon the attention of the Professor, I would ask him gravely to consider whether he can imagine a question of more interest or of more importance to the Protestant cause, than—*What means baptism?*

Circumstances can make a mere trifle as important as life itself. Now, waving all controversy about the abstract merits and essence of the institution of baptism, let us look at it through the circumstances which now surround it, and thence learn whether it does not require more grave investigation than what has yet been bestowed upon it. What, then, are the circumstances which now attend this question?

In forming a just estimate of these we need not travel out of the United States. We have now half a million of immersed Christians, and say more than half a million of unimmersed Christians, of different denominations, who are in all other matters and things equally creditable professors of Christianity, and sufficiently orthodox to coalesce in one communion. Now if union be as desirable as Jesus Christ represented it in his intercessions for the unity of his disciples, (John xvii.) or if the want of it be as criminal, and as destructive to the character and influence of Christian religion as Paul describes it to the Corinthians, then does not any thing about "rites, forms, or ceremonies," as some would irreverently call some of the commandments of the Saviour, I ask, does not any matter, however small in itself, which becomes the cause of separation, assume an immense importance, and call for the most profound attention of all who regard the union of the church as essential to the conversion of the world? For my part, I have for many years regarded the controversy about baptism, apart from the meaning of the institution, as incomparably surpassing in its consequences upon the destinies of Christianity, every other discussion in Protestant Christendom. It alone presents an impassable gulph between those denominated "Evangelical Christians" of every name. Deserves it not, then, the highest consideration which can be bestowed on any question?

Now if the Paidobaptists are in good earnest in their prayers and their professions respecting the co-operation of Christians, becomes it them to proceed any longer in their attempts to perpetuate a practice which necessarily must defeat all their prayers and efforts for communion, when that practice cannot be regarded by themselves, in the judgment of its most learned supporters, as standing on the same unequivocal authority with the practice opposed to it? Conceding to them all they have to say in favor of its *probability*, their

own concessions to the Baptists allow the Baptists to conclude that their practice is not merely more scriptural, but absolutely right in itself. All Christendom, Catholic and Protestant, admits than an immersed believer is baptized according to the New Testament—according to the certain and universally acknowledged import of the term *baptizo*, and according to the practice of the primitive church in its earliest annals. Now admitting the evidence to be only plainer, more direct and unequivocal in favor of immersion than of sprinkling, the question is, Which of the two parties must yield to the other? Not the stronger to the weaker—the more evident to the less evident—the certain to the probable. But some will say that the minority in numbers must yield to the majority. If so, the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians must yield to the immersed; for, in these United States, it is presumed from the documents before us, that the immersed adults greatly exceed the sprinkled adults in the whole United States.

In one half century immersion has gained on sprinkling more than four per cent. per annum. From less than forty thousand, the immersed now exceed four hundred thousand; and, in the ratio of late years, they will, in less than fifty years, outnumber the whole Protestant population of this union. But we argue not that the minority should yield to the majority in numbers; but that the less probable should yield to the more probable, our opponents themselves being judges.

Our Professor's essay will satisfy any man of common sense, that, argue the matter on what ground any one pleases, immersion is the most probable. If he take the word *baptizo*, the preposition in construction with it, the places where the action was performed, the expositions of it in the epistles, and the voice of all antiquity, the whole together, and each section of evidence by itself, is in favor of immersion.

In this view of matters we wave our own views altogether, and reason from theirs; for we do not admit that there is the least probability that ever man, woman, or child was sprinkled by the authority of Jesus Christ: but admitting, as they contend, that there is probable evidence in their favor, and only mere probable evidence in our favor, then the question is, Which party ought in reason and justice to yield to the other?

All the world, Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, admit that immersion is baptism. We cannot, therefore, in conscience, give up this matter. They may be immersed—we cannot be sprinkled. I say, they may be immersed without injury, because they are more certain that immersion is the action that Christ commanded, than they can be that sprinkling is acceptable in his sight. This I must infer from all that Professor Stuart has to say in his own defence. How much more reasonable, then, would it have been, and how much more consistent for him to have exhorted his brethren, as they pray for union, communion, and co-operation, to put an end to the controversy by being immersed themselves, and then unite cordially with those

brethren whose zeal and constancy in the most trying times, demonstrate, beyond doubt, their regard for the commandments of the Lord, and their willingness to suffer persecution rather than yield their convictions to the commandments of men clothed with a little brief authority.

Enough has been said to show how utterly unavailing every effort to diminish our respect for any divine institution must be, especially by one who tells us as he proceeds, that, in his judgment, we have all classic authority, all antiquity, and most probably the New Testament acceptation of words on our side of the question. With all respect for that judgment, we request him to consider whether, with all these premises and the preceding considerations before us, we may not, in all justice, retort upon him his own words—"Those who are ready to break the church in pieces by contending for rites and forms, seem to me not well entitled to take the position, that others are chargeable with this, who will not succumb to such doctrines"?

But we have still some other things to suggest to the consideration of our much esteemed friend. EDITOR.

The first Christian Emperor a Persecutor.

His Edict against the Arians.

"VICTOR CONSTANTINUS, MAXIMUS, AUGUSTUS—*To the Bishops and People.*

"Whereas *Arius* has followed the example of the wicked and irreligious, 'tis but just that he should suffer the same ignominy as they: therefore, as *Porphyry*, that enemy of piety, for the impious writings he composed against religion, was justly rewarded with lasting infamy, and buried under a load of reproaches, and his profane writings have been entirely destroyed; so it is now our pleasure that Arius and his followers be branded with the name of *Porphyrians*, that, as they have copied his morals, they may derive their denomination too from him. Moreover, if any of Arius' writings shall be found extant, we order it to be burnt; that not only his wicked doctrine may be utterly abolished, but that there may not be the least monument of him conveyed to posterity. This likewise we declare, that if any person shall be found to have concealed any writing composed by Arius, by not immediately producing the said book, and committing it to the flames, he shall be punished with death. For as soon as he is convicted of the fact, he shall suffer capital punishment. God preserve you."

This is a fair sample of the spirit of all political religious establishments. It is a fact worthy of remembrance, that when something called Christianity mounted the throne, it began to hurl its anathemas against those who dissented from the popular opinions. For our part, we have always regarded the conversion of Constantine as a political affair; and the above bloody decree is full proof of the spirit which he received after his conversion to the faith. We have no better opinion of the Christianity of those who are seeking, by every conceivable exertion, to get into their hands the government of this country. The Great Teacher said, "All who take the sword shall perish by the sword." EDITOR.

New Version and Dr. Cleland.

NO. III.

IN the press of our affairs on leaving home for a three months' tour, we give the Doctor and our readers an article from a *Presbyterian* print. It appeared in the "PRESBYTERIAN," without note or comment, on April 10th of the present year. There are many good arguments which may be drawn from this document in favor of a more correct version than the common one. From a careful perusal of this article, the Doctor may, perchance, learn (if not too old to learn) how much credit is due to his candor and remarks upon the King's version and the New. His friend Horne, from whom he has stolen so many encomiums upon the common version, was not more infallible than himself, though much more candid and intelligent on all such matters: I say '*stolen*,' because he that borrows liberally from any writer, and passes it off upon the public as his own, is, in the common law of the commonwealth of letters, called a *plagiarist*, which is the literary name of a thief. How much Dr. Cleland has dealt in contraband goods and in these furtive tricks, we may make appear more evident when we come to that part of his correspondence.

EDITOR.

EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE.

The canons of the Protestant Episcopal church provide for the appointment of suitable persons to compare new editions of the Bible, which may be submitted to them for that purpose, with a standard edition, and certify their correctness. The publications of the American Bible Society are also carefully compared with a standard copy. Besides these instances, we know of no other guarantee that the public have of the correctness of the numberless editions which are in circulation. They are commonly printed as any other book, from the most convenient copy, and passed through the press with the usual rapidity. Of course it would be easy for a designing person to mutilate the Scriptures, and the changes might for a long time escape detection. In Great Britain the privilege of printing the Bible is restricted to the King's Printer and the Universities; and being entrusted to a few individuals, the purity of the text is strongly warranted. No such monopoly should be desired in this country; but it would be well to have some responsible name or names attached to every edition, to vouch for its fidelity.

Our attention has been drawn to the subject by having occasion frequently to notice errors which prove the grossest negligence on the part of the publishers. For instance, we have before us a handsome octavo Bible, published in Philadelphia a few years since, in which 1 Kings i. 21. reads thus, "Otherwise it shall come to pass when my Lord the king shall *dagger* sleep with his fathers, that I and my son Solomon shall be counted offenders."

The word *dagger* has been obviously printed by a misapprehension of a correction of the proof-reader, who directed that a dagger (†) should be placed before the word "sleep," to indicate the marginal reference; but the printer has incorporated the word into the verse, and it has not been revised.

After writing the above paragraph we saw the February number of the London Monthly Review, which notices a pamphlet lately issued, titled, "The existing Monoply, an inadequate protection of the authorized version of Scripture. In four letters to the Bishop of London. With specimens of the intentional and other departures from the authorized standard." From the facts drawn by the reviewer from the statements of the writer (Thomas Curtis) it appears that the restriction of the right to print the Bible has been far from

insuring the correctness of the impressions. It seems that the office of King's Printer is now in the possession of a barrister, who farms it out for an annual compensation; and that the whole business of reviewing the press is confided to the printer. Twenty years ago, a person in one of the privileged printing-offices detected 731 errors, from Genesis to Jeremiah, in the copy used as a standard. Mr. Curtis has published a list of various errors which he has detected in his own examination of several editions. Some of these are as follows:

Judges xi. 11.—The authorized versions printed "*children* of Gilead" for "elders of Gilead," for forty-five years before the error was discovered.

Genesis xxxiii. 5.—"*She* said," for "he said," making Rachel or Leah the speaker, instead of Esau.

Psalm xlii. 1.—"As the *heart* panteth."

Jeremiah xxvii. 3.—"Come to *Jeremiah*," for "come to Jerusalem."

Ezekiel xlvii. 10.—"The *fishes* shall stand upon it," for "fishers." An error which remained seventeen years.

Zechariah vi. 2.—"There came *forth*," for "four.

Mark vii. 14.—"*And* said," for "he said;" destroying the sense of several verses.

Mark xii. 14.—"They say unto *me*," for "him."

Luke xiv. 26.—"Hate his own *wife*," for "life."

John xvii. 25.—"The world hath known thee," for "hath *not* known thee."

Romans xvi. 18.—"By good *works* deceive," for "good words."

Galatians v. 17.—"The flesh lusteth *after* the spirit," for "against."

Hebrews ix. 14.—"Purge your conscience from *good* works," for "dead works."

Jude 16.—"These are *murderers*," for "murmurers."

Revelation xviii. 22.—Two lines omitted.

In Galatians iv. 29. Mr. Curtis discovered a blunder, caused apparently by a similar misunderstanding to that we have noticed in the Philadelphia Bible; the words "*to remain*" having probably been written on the proof, referring to the comma at the word "Spirit," but which the printer has incorporated with the text.

Of several of the editions thus discovered to be incorrect, it is remarked, "These are the editions which the Rev. Mr. Horne so much commends, and which he states the Episcopal church of North America has resolved to consider standards."

Efforts are now in progress in England to remedy this important evil. A parliamentary committee was appointed in the spring of 1832, to investigate the duties of the King's Printer, and we suppose their report has been lately printed; for we find in the London Advocate of January 28th, a report of the examinations of some witnesses on the subject, though the nature of the inquiry is not mentioned. We take some passages from them:—

Were you brought up a bookseller?

Yes.

How long did you carry on that business; and when did you retire?

I retired about seven years ago, and I had been in business twenty years.

In point of fact, have you found several errors in the edition that you have?

Yes: I am not aware of any edition I have had to examine, which has been without errors. The fewest errors I have discovered were in an edition printed by Pasham, in 1776, and another printed at Edinburgh in 1811, both of which I have here, [producing the same.] These are the most accurate and most beautiful Bibles I have found.

Have you directed your attention to the editions printed by either of the Universities?

I believe the editions which were usually printed at Oxford have been the most incorrect of all. In one case, a schoolfellow of mine corrected a copy of a nonpareil Bible, and he found upwards of 12,000 errors in it, which he sent to the then Archbishop of Canterbury, who, in return, sent him a handsome letter, and £10 for his trouble.

Who was the gentleman?

Mr. William Randall. It was about fifteen or sixteen years ago.

Did you see the Bible?

I did, with all the errors marked: they included errors of every description, with regard to *italic* words and errors of punctuation; and every kind of error was marked out.

Had it marginal references?

No.

From what edition did he take his standard?

From Blayney's quarto edition.

In that there are some mistakes, are there not?

Yes, there are some trifling errors.

With regard to the Cambridge Bibles, have you found many errors in the early editions generally?

Cambridge has not been a favorite place for the printing of Bibles; they have not been so extensive in their sale as Oxford.

Has not the monopoly led to the practice of false title-pages, in order to evade the penalties?

Yes, to an immense extent.

What led to the printing of Baskerville's and Pasham's Bible?

It was the wish to give a beautiful and correct edition. The most beautiful book that has appeared by the King's Printer was Baskett's, and that was so incorrect, that they made a blunder even in the head-line, putting "The Parable of the *Vinegar*," instead of "The Parable of the Vineyard," and a multitude of errors of the same kind.

You have delivered in as almost a standard, certainly as an edition which contains, in your judgment, no errors, the small edition by Pasham in 1776?

When I say 'no error,' I say I have not discovered one; I should think it utterly impossible to print the Bible without an error.

From your general experience as a bookseller, as well as your observations as a collector of Bibles, are you of opinion that, supposing the patent rights were abolished, competition would generally secure fidelity in the text, at least equal to that which exists under the present system?

Yes; I feel confident that there are a great number of persons who would devote their lives, if it were necessary, to producing an immaculate edition of the Bible, if it were possible so to do. Were it not for the existing patent, which prevents its being done, I have known persons who would have done it.

How many editions have you of English Bibles altogether?

I cannot state the precise number; but I suppose about four hundred.

How many editions of the English Bible have you been able to collect?

I have somewhere about four hundred, but I have not collected any common Bibles; the whole that I have are Bibles that are interesting from some peculiar circumstance connected with them.

The observations you have made with respect to errors, apply principally to editions of a more ancient date; have you examined any of the modern editions printed by the Universities or the King's Printers, and can you state whether they contain more or less errors?

I cannot state positively, because I have not looked much to the modern editions, unless there was something particular in them. I observed on Saturday night, in looking into Mr. Longman's edition of 1822, now on the table, that in the 18th Psalm, 50th verse, there is, "to his *appointed*," instead of "to his anointed." [*S. S. Journal.*]

What the Churches ought to do.

WE expect to devote more attention to these matters soon. Meanwhile, without note or comment, we shall hear brother Winans:-

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, September 23, 1833.

Brother Campbell—I HAVE thought that it would be well for the congregations to take the following propositions under consideration, viz:—

Major Proposition.——The Apostles taught and authorized the churches *to do* all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded them *to do*.—Therefore,

1st. The churches were taught by the Apostles to preach the gospel to the world, and to baptize them that believed.

2d. The churches were taught to teach the baptized believers to observe all the commands of Jesus; to love one another; to break bread together; and to pray and praise in concert.

3d. The churches were taught to set apart of their members men qualified to rule, as rulers; those qualified to teach, as teachers; those qualified to exhort, as exhorters; those qualified to judge, as judges; and those qualified to reclaim, as reclaimers.

4th. All thus set apart by the church, act by authority of the church to the extent of its jurisdiction.

5th. All who are born of the institution appointed of God, (water and the Spirit,) and eat of the same loaf, and drink of the same cup, are bound to obey the laws of the King wherever they be; and for a breach of the laws, the subjects of the King have the right to reprove and punish them according to law.

6th. The churches were taught and authorized to send special messengers to other churches, and to the world, to execute all the social relations and duties commanded by the King—to announce the King's proclamation to the world—and make subjects for the King—and to diffuse charity among his subjects.

In haste I subscribe myself an humble subject of the King of kings,

M. WINANS.

BETHANY, *Brooke County, Va.*

To B. W. Stone.

Respected Brother,

IN the close of your letter under consideration, (C. M. page 210,) you object to my refusing to admit N. W's position against the vicarious sufferings of Christ for the sins of his people. Your words are—"You combat another sentiment of Noah Worcester, who refuses "to admit that "any being in the universe can be properly said to "have a right to transfer a just punishment from the guilty to the in-"nocent." "You think differently; *i. e.* you think that God has that "right, and has exercised it in transferring the just punishment of "guilty sinners from them to his innocent Son. To prove this you "quote Isaiah liii. 6. and 2 Cor. v. 21. "All we, like sheep, have gone "astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord has "laid on him the iniquity of us all. For he has made him a sin offer-

"ing for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made *the justified* of "God by him." Your opinion is, that Christ was not actually guilty "of our iniquities, but was treated as if he had been so; the Father in- "flicting upon him the just wages of sin; namely, sufferings and death. "He laid on him the punishment due to us all."——All this I believe and avow, and must, therefore, of necessity, combat the above sentiment of N. W. And, indeed, his first rule of scripture interpretation will amply justify my so doing. [See "Bible News," page 217.]—"The Scriptures were inspired to instruct common readers, by using words according to their common acceptation, and not to confound them by an abuse of language." Now let any one read the above quotations according to this rule; and must he not admit "that God has transferred the just punishment of guilty sinners from *them* to his *innocent son*"? Nay, let him read the whole 53d chapter of Isaiah, and say if it can mean any thing else than this.—Then let him read all the correlate passages in the New Testament, one of which I have quoted above, and he must admit, that if language has any common acceptation, any fixed meaning at all, then did Christ, "the holy one of God, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," having nothing in common with them but the human nature, "suffer for sins, the just for [or on account of] the unjust, that he might bring us to God." And this he did not accidentally, as Uriah suffered for the sin of David; but on set purpose, and by a divine appointment; for "he was made a sin offering for us;" "the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all; and now once in the end of the world has he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." And here I would appeal to N. W. and his advocates;—Shall we depart from the plain common sense meaning of the concurrent testimonies of the Holy Scriptures, concerning the nature and intention of the death of Christ, to make room for his assumption? I hope not. "Let God be true, and every man a liar," who ventures to contradict him; for—"he laid on his innocent Son the iniquities of us all;" and "by his stripes we are healed." Yet you say, "Were I in this sentiment I would boldly avow myself a Universalian:"—for—"If Christ bore the punishment due to us all, that we might be made the justified of God, who shall condemn one of the human family?" Dear brother, is this supposed consequence a sufficient argument to prove that the Scriptures do not mean what they say upon this all-important subject? I say, *all-important;* for "whom he justified them he also glorified;" consequently, if not justified, then not glorified. Now God has but one way of justifying the ungodly; namely, "through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiatory through faith in his blood—to declare at this time his righteousness, that he might be *just*, and the *justifier* of him who believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 24—26. and iv. 4, 5. Wherefore, "being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Rom. v. 9. I say, then, shall we concede this all-important point, which lies at the very foundation of our salvation, to give place to N. W's position; or to avoid the supposed consequence of "Universalianism?" For my

part, in order that we may hold this all-important truth, I see no occasion either to admit the latter or refute the former, unless it be granted that we are to hold nothing as certainly true, as long as there are objections brought against it, that we cannot answer. But this, we presume, will not be granted.

All we shall say, however, in the meantime, with respect to the former, is, that if there can be no just right to transfer a punishment from the guilty to the innocent; then, in justice, there can be no such thing as suretyship: every law that admits it, and every judgment that inflicts it, must be essentially unjust. But it may be said, the surety makes himself guilty, that is, responsible, for he does it wittingly and willingly: we answer, so did our Surety—our Enguos, Heb. vii. 22. our God, Job xix. 25. "Then, said I, Lo! I come to do thy will, O God." Heb x. 5—10.—And, as for the latter,—the avowal of universalism, I must confess I cannot see how the Scripture account of the vicarious sufferings of the Saviour leads to such a conclusion; seeing we are informed by the Saviour himself, that he laid down his life for the sheep,—for those that the Father had given him, for whom also he explicitly prays. John x. 15. & xvii. 2, 9. 20. Now, certainly, to infer the salvation of all these would be scripturism, not universalism: for the Saviour himself says, "All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me: and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.—And this is the Father's will who hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day," &c. John vi. 37, 39. Farther, if we are desirous to know who these happy folks shall be, we are told, verse 40, "This is the will of him who sent me, that whoever recognizes the Son, and believes on him, should obtain eternal life, and that I should raise him again at the last day." So much for the latitudinarian alternative.

I now proceed to notice your last difficulty in the letter before me: namely,—"It is admitted that the government of God is perfect; and "must be, therefore, a perfect model for all governments on earth. "Let it be considered as a principle in the divine government, that it "is right for the innocent to suffer in the room of the guilty, and that "the guilty be released from punishment on this account; then should "not the same principle be admitted in all civil governments?" I answer, the word *perfect* is a relative term; and, therefore, supposes a rule by which the alleged perfection is to be tried: consequently, what would be a perfection in one government, might be an imperfection in another. If so, we presume it will be readily granted in favor of the divine government in the case before us; the relations of the Governor and governed, as well as the variety both of the subjects and objects of the divine government, being so vastly different from those of earthly governments. But, as this might be supposed a kind of begging the question, we shall not insist upon it; nor, indeed, is there any necessity; for there is no such principle supposed in order to justify the substitution of Jesus Christ, nor so much as implied in it. It is quite a peculiar, preternatural, extraordinary case; and, there-

fore, can neither be predicated upon the natural relations of things, nor afford any precedent for imitation. Before it, there was nothing like it, nor shall be after it—such a thing shall never take place again; "Christ dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Who, then, would argue from such a peculiar—such an extraordinary event, to a general principle? To infer a universal conclusion from a particular occurrence, every body knows is most illogical. The case before us is most peculiar. It is that of the Father of the universe with his only begotten Son, about the redemption and salvation of a portion of their guilty creatures, to the glory of the divine nature, and of the divine persons subsisting in it; and also to the high and everlasting advancement of the creatures to be thus redeemed, and to the infinite satisfaction and delight of all the holy angels. [See John xvii. 1, 2, 22, 24. Rev. v. 9—13, &c.] Now who would think of making this most extraordinary, unparallelled case, a common example for the administration of human governments, amongst fellow-creatures, where both the parties and the objects are so immensely different as to admit of no comparison. I mean the principle adopted for the accomplishment of all this; namely, the vicarious sufferings of the Son of God. Surely, no rational mind could be so extravagant. Wherefore, I shall proceed no farther in the exposure of this absurd assumption; but go on to notice your remaining objections, contained in your second letter, now before me.

You proceed by saying, "In the close of my first letter, I was re-"marking on your exposition of Isaiah liii. 6. and 2 Cor. v. 21. "He "laid on him the iniquity of us all." This, in your view, means he "laid on him the punishment due to us all. You think, by this vica-"rious punishment we are justified. "Being now justified by his blood, "we shall be saved from wrath through him." Rom. v. 9. You add a "little to the text—"that being justified by *faith* in his blood." Dear "brother, what has faith to do in the justification of which you speak? "If A is guilty of murder, and is condemned to die; and if B becomes "his surety, and bears the punishment due to A; then is not A clear, "whether he believe or not, that B died for him? A's faith produces "no effect whatever in the matter of his justification. But why talk of "justification or forgiveness at all in A's case? The debt due was "fully paid by B, the surety of A. Could the law, or executive now "say to A, I forgive or justify you freely by my grace? Not freely, "might A say, for my surety has paid my due or debt, fully in my stead "—I have nothing to be forgiven—I see no grace or favor shown me, "in this forgiveness or justification. In fact, there is none but in the "surety;—if there is, I should be glad to see it proved by Scripture "testimony."——Thus you object.

And now, dear brother, do you not perceive that your objection goes to make void the Scripture account both of *faith and favor*, in the salvation of men by the sufferings and death of Christ? and also of the justice of God in our salvation? You charge me with adding a little to the text in Rom. v. 9. My supplement, however, is both contextural and constitutional. The chapter commences with, "Justified

by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ"—"whom God hath set forth to be a propitiatory through faith in his blood." chap. iii. 25. Hence it is through faith in his blood that he becomes *our* propitiatory, *our* peace, *our* righteousness or justification; faith or belief being the constitutional principle both of union, and of enjoyment: for, "as many as received him, to *them* gave he power [or privilege] to become the sons of God; even to *them* that *believe on his name*." John i. 12. And is not his official name Saviour, Redeemer? Matth. i. 21. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."—"In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Eph. i. 7. For—"You were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Peter i 18, 19. "Being justified freely, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God has set forth to be a propitiatory through faith in his blood." Rom. iii. 24, 25. "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation." Rev. v. 9.

Now your statement goes to nullify, most explicitly, this whole scheme of salvation; for, according to it, there can be no *price*, *ransom*, or equivalent whatever, for the procurement of our salvation, in consideration of which God might consider it just and reasonable to pardon the guilty, without destroying both faith and favor: whereas, according to the above quotations, "we are justified freely by the divine favor [or grace] through the redemption that is in [or by] Christ Jesus;—redeemed to God by his blood;—saved from wrath through him;—redeemed not with corruptible things, as silver and gold; but with the precious blood of Christ;—who came to give his life a ransom for many." Matth. xx. 28. But, according to your statement, if there be any *price*, *ransom*, or *equivalent* proposed, required, or provided on the part of Heaven, on account of which pardon is granted to the guilty, the exercise of faith on their part, and of sin-pardoning mercy on the part of God, is rendered absolutely and forever impossible; notwithstanding all that is most expressly declared to the contrary in the above passages, and in many others that might be quoted to the same purpose. Yet, after all that has been, or may be objected by erring mortals, it is declared to be a fixed and fundamental principle in the divine procedure, that "without the *shedding of blood* there is *no remission*." Heb. ix. 22. And that no other blood can effect this but the blood of Christ. Heb. x. 4. And that "now once in the end of the world he has appeared to put away sin by *the sacrifice of himself*." Heb. ix. 26. And that it is by faith in his blood we have access to the enjoyment of the divine mercy. Rom. iii. 25. And that God has adopted this way of showing mercy for the sake of his justice; "that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus." Rom. iii. 26. Wherefore, as I said above, your objection not only goes to destroy the exercise both of faith and favor in the salvation of men, by the sufferings and death of Christ, but also of the divine justice; for the display of which, that he might be "a just God and a Saviour," he has expressly provided, in justifying the believing sin-

ner through the blood of Jesus. Rom. iii. 25, 26. Whereas, according to your statement, justice can have nothing to do with the salvation of sinners; for if there be any provision made to meet the demands of law and justice, you "see no favor shown in this forgiveness or justification." Nevertheless, it is written, "Christ has *redeemed us* from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Gal. iii. 13. And again, "Christ once *suffered* for sins, *the just* for *the unjust*, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh." 1 Pet. iii. 18. Consequently, our redemption is ascribed to his blood, as the price paid for it. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. Accordingly believers are said to be bought with a price. 1 Cor. vi. 20.

But farther, your objectional statement in the supposed case of A and B, is not a fair parallel; consequently, not to the purpose: for A and B are fellow-creatures, fellow-subjects, with neither of whom the law or government has any thing to do, but according to their respective conduct; wherefore, should the latter offer himself to suffer in the room of the former, and the law admit it, the executive governor could be entitled to no thanks, for he had no efficiency in procuring the substitute, nor any peculiar interest in him more than in any other common subject. But is this the case with the great God in the substitution of his only begotten Son for the life of the world? For, first, are not the guilty subjects his absolute property? 2d. Does he not provide and appoint the substitute? 3d. Does not his beloved Son willingly accept of the appointment, having an equal interest in the guilty subjects, and an equal love to them? And, then, have not the Father and the Son a just right to do all this for their guilty creatures if they please? And would not all this be pure favor to the guilty rebels? And would not their pardon upon repentance, through the belief of this, be to them pure mercy? And would not the making of this great sacrifice the *sine qua non*—the indispensable prerequisite, ground, and reason of forgiveness—and faith in it for this purpose, the sole principle of the enjoyment of this forgiveness, be perfectly consistent with, and declarative of, the divine justice, mercy, truth, and holiness? and, at the same time, equally adapted to the condition and relief of the perishing guilty, as if no such sacrifice had been required?—and also, infinitely better calculated to deter every subject of the divine government from the commission of sin, than if mercy had been exercised without any regard to, or demonstration of, its infinite demerit? For, surely, if there be no forgiveness in the case of fallen man, the mere dupe of satanic subtilty, but at the inestimable price of the life's blood of the Son of God, and that too, exacted in the most degrading circumstances, and with the most terrible and dolorous concomitants—infinitely intense, indeed, must be the divine abhorrence of sin—infinite the inflexible and unsparing strictness of the divine justice in punishing it—and, of course, infinitely dreadful and hopeless the condition of the transgressor, in any portion of the vast dominion of God. Contemplating this awfully glorious display of the divine character, in which mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other—we feel disposed to "serve

the Lord with fear, and to rejoice with trembling." Ps. lxxxv. 10. and ii. 11. THOMAS CAMPBELL.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

For the Millennial Harbinger.

To the United Baptist.

Brethren,

YOU have likely seen in the Millennial Harbinger, for May, 1833, a note from me to brother Campbell, in which I promised to give you my reasons for entering the present reformation; which I now proceed to do. In this I wish not to be understood to say, that we attempt to reform religion; but to reform our lives, and restore the religion taught by Christ and his Apostles. Let me farther remark, that there has been a declension from primitive Christianity will be denied by none, but none will admit that they have departed. As this letter is directed to the United Baptists, give me leave to examine some of the doctrines and practices instituted by you. And first, names are instituted among you, and these names keep up a distinction in the kingdom of Christ. Many young people unite themselves to your body, when they know but little; they then read the word and see that names are forbidden; consequently will prefer to obey God rather than man. In order (I mean Baptist order) they are not permitted to withdraw in peace, but they must be excluded, and declared to the world as excluded men from society, because they wish to obey the Lord rather than men. Being confident the followers of Christ could not unite upon the name Baptist, I determined to lay it apart as superfluous, and to receive in meekness the names in the engrafted word. I receive the name Christian, a follower of Christ; Disciple, a learner of Christ; Saint, one set apart; a Brother, one born of the same parents—*i. e.* the water and the Spirit.

Paul knew names of distinction would be injurious in the kingdom, and therefore forbade the introduction of them, when he this declares, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii. 27, 28. Again he declares, "For one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" now if it rendered a man carnal to be of, or to be called after an inspired Apostle, will it not render us carnal to be called after any man, or any name we may select, not found in the sacred code. In this, brethren, you must see you have departed from primitive custom. You assume to yourselves the authority to make laws in the kingdom of Christ, and to substitute a faith or confession of opinions, which you call the faith once delivered to the saints, and make it a test of fellowship.

To this confession of opinions I could not subscribe, but determined to be in a body formed upon primitive principles, and have no rules

of discipline but such as I found in the New Testament. I was, and am confident, both from observation and experience, that neither order nor purity of character, as a body, could be maintained, in any proportionate degree, without discipline.

But a pure creed and a pure worship, however right in themselves, are not sufficient. A practical observance of the Scripture injunctions is requisite to form a complete character of a Christian church. There are objections to this pure discipline, arising from the bad use that has been made of it, and the wicked purpose to which it has been applied; by many it is not understood—it is but little of their concern—they do not see the utility of it, as they believe it was not addressed to the understandings of men, and therefore turn aside from the mild and wise discipline of Christ, to a fable or the discipline of men. You have not the privilege to make laws in the kingdom. Isaiah says, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; the *government* shall be upon his shoulder." If the government is to be on Jesus' shoulder, and you make one law in the kingdom, you take so much of the government from Jesus' shoulder and place it upon yours. But you will say, the word is not sufficient to keep us together. Brethren, is it a good work for Christians to dwell together in unity? If it be, Paul says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, *thoroughly* furnished unto all good works." If, then, we are *thoroughly* furnished to all good works—when we have any more furnishing, it will be unto an evil work; and this accords with the confusion, division, strife, and animosity, that now exist in the different sects of the day. If the word be sufficient, your confessions or laws are superfluous; and if you will take the Apostle's advice, you will lay apart all superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word.

You may say you did not make these laws—your fathers made them, and it is lawful for you to live under them. Paul would not say so. He says, "We dare not make ourselves of the number," &c. —"But we will not boast of things without our measure, but according to the measure of the rule which God hath distributed to us," &c. 2 Cor. x. 12, 13. When we do any thing, we must do it as did the Apostles. This practice I adopt not by any authority of my own, but as a member of the apostolic church; for while we govern ourselves by the rules, and conform to the practices which the Apostles laid down, I do not think that time produces any separation; but acting upon the same principles with them, we must regard ourselves in the same church;—but not without. You teach men to believe they cannot understand, believe, nor obey the word of God. This, so far as they receive your teachings, produces in them a total indifference and inattention to the living word of God. Can a doctrine be of God, and sanctioned by Heaven, which leads men into this evil?

There is such a mass of evidence that men were saved by believing and obeying the truth, that I am utterly astonished how serious and honest men can read the word of God, and not see that the Scrip-

tures are able to make us wise unto salvation. As the scheme of salvation is recorded in the Scriptures, they must be the light of men—without them we know little of God—nothing of a world to come, or of our future destiny—they are the only source of information in matters of religion. Of what vast importance, then, are the Scriptures to us—and what is equal to a true, rational understanding of them? How ought they to be reverenced and obeyed, as they only are capable of making us wise unto salvation! Impressed with these sentiments, how painful is it to hear serious men, through the influence of their former teaching, speak of the Scriptures as a sealed book, a dead letter, only ink and paper! &c. which evidently proves the prejudice and weakness of their minds in religious concerns. I cannot but think, notwithstanding great professions and apparent sanctity, that it is a very irreverent manner of speaking, to call the words of the living God *a dead letter.* It only proves that they who thus speak know but little of the words of eternal life, as will appear from the following scriptures. Our Lord says, "My words they are spirit and they are life." Paul says, "The word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword;" and thanks God that the Thessalonians received it not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God, "which worketh effectually in them that believe." Peter tells the churches that "they were born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." When men read that the word is the power of God to salvation, and assert it to be a dead letter, does it not prove that they either do not understand or believe that portion of the sacred word?

If you will begin and follow all the holy men of old, who spoke as the Holy Spirit moved upon them, in all their teaching they never once taught them that they could not believe and obey God their rightful sovereign; but entirely to the reverse of this did they teach. Hear the Holy Jesus himself say, "He that believeth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." And hear it taught, "He that believeth not maketh God a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son," &c. &c. I say, would they teach us thus the importance of believing the record that God hath given of his Son, if men were not able to believe what God has said is the truth? This would be plainly teaching us that God would condemn men for not doing what he has given them no power to do. It is exactly the same on the other side of the question—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved"—"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved"—"He that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God," &c. &c. But you will say, 'The Spirit must enter the heart of the sinner and produce faith.' Did the Apostles teach thus? I answer, No. In examining the ministry of the Apostles, I never find them saying faith is a gift, nor do I hear them instructing unbelievers o pray for it, or that they must have the influence of the Spirit to enable them to believe or to reveal Christ in their hearts, according to

the language of modern preachers. From time to time I have had much conversation with religious people, and preachers not a few: I have asked them for their authority for teaching that unbelievers must pray for the gift of faith, or the influence of the Spirit; when they would answer, 'they thought there were plenty of such texts, but that just then they could not recollect them.' This was, and is, the common reply. I would allow them three or six months, but still their memories failed them; and no wonder: for that man must have a notable memory, indeed, who can furnish passages of Scripture which are not in the book. The Apostles always addressed men as rational creatures, capable of understanding, believing, and obeying what they taught. Brethren, can you appear before God in judgment, and plead that it was right to teach men they could not obey him, or will you tremble when you reflect that you have taught them the traditions of your fathers, in opposition to the command of Heaven—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—"Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"? Jesus says, 'Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.' Luke xxiv. 46, 47.

This repentance and remission of sins was preached on the day of Pentecost, at the place where Christ said it should begin; and, notwithstanding he said it was to be preached among all nations, you oppose repentance and baptism for remission, and teach men they must not obey the Lord in baptism until they have received that for which Peter commanded them to be baptized. If a man were to come to you and tell you all that any one told the Apostles, you would not receive him. Is this, brethren, doing the will of the Master? A field of objections to your practices opens to my view; but I must close; my sheet is full. I will conclude by requesting you to read the word; and when God speaks, hear; and when he commands, obey him; recollecting that "many will seek to enter in, and will not be able." May you all enter, accompanied by your unworthy brother, is my prayer for Christ's sake! Amen!

HENRY THOMAS.

Conversation at Mr. Goodal's.

[*Continued from page* 418.]

Mr. Williamson.—ALL temptations are motives, you say, Mr. Reed, or arguments addressed to our passions or appetites.

Mr. Reed.—In all my reasonings upon human actions, as respects their good or evil character, I must view them in the light of the motives from which they proceed; for the same action, at different times and under different circumstances, is both good and evil.

Mr. Williamson.—You judge of actions not from their tendency,

but from the principle which dictates them. But are we not right in calling any action *good* which has a good tendency?

Mr. Reed.—And would you call the selling of Joseph for a slave a good action, because it was good in its tendency—the means of saving millions from famine?

Mr. Williamson.—I now understand you. No action, however good in its tendency, can be virtuous or morally good, if it proceed from an evil motive; and an action having an evil tendency, but proceeding from a good motive, is still a virtuous and praiseworthy action.

Mr. Reed.—This is enough for my purpose. Temptations are arguments, not physical drawings or impulses. These arguments are called *motives*, because they have moving power. Now if Satan present no unworthy motive, there is no sin in yielding to his suggestions or arguments. The sin is in obeying an unworthy motive; yielding to some bias which is derogatory to the dignity of our nature, which consists in honoring God and our own nature, whether in our own persons or in the persons of others.

Father Goodal.—It would remove an immense pile of learned rubbish from our shelves—of useless lumber from our libraries—it would save the lungs of many preachers, and indirectly the souls of many sinners, if the truth of one proposition was clearly perceived. I will leave it to some of my grand-children to state it from the premises now before us.

Robert Fowler.—Seeing all are silent, I will make a guess at it. Spirits in approaching spirits clothe themselves in arguments, and influence one another by motives.

Father Goodal.—That is substantially the proposition. *Spirits operate on spirits only by arguments.* These arguments, adapted to the nature of spirits in all their conditions, whether embodied or disembodied, become motives to action; and consequently, as the motive, so the action, in its moral nature and character.

Mr. Reed.—And let me add, that no argument can move to action unless it be understood, or, in so far as it is understood. Any influence, then, which spirits good or evil can exert on human agents, in whatever form it is presented, will be always found to consist entirely in the adaptation of the argument to the understanding—to the passions, appetites, and propensities of the individual.

Mr. Williamson.—I perceive that many of the temptations offered men in ancient times, can easily be explained on this principle; but others require some explanation. For example, when Satan instigated Judas to betray his Master, and sell him for thirty pieces of silver, have we any account of any motive which he presented?

Mr. Reed.—It is not necessary to prove the fact that arguments were used, that we always have the arguments recorded. It is enough that we sometimes have them stated, and that no instance has occurred which can establish any other view of the matter. And what more natural in this case, that seeing Judas was a thief, a covetous person, and fearing he would never have an opportunity of realizing his expectations of gain from his connexion with Jesus, Satan should sug-

gest that now he must seize the opportunity of gaining something, for that his chief was about to fall into the hands of his enemies. Another suggestion, which the sequel renders probable, was, that his Master could easily extricate himself out of the hands of his enemies, if, indeed, he could do any thing for himself or his friends; and in that case Judas would do him no injury. So, on all the premises, now was the instant for Judas to do something for himself. I say, what more natural than such arguments, with all the history of Judas and Satan before us?

Mr. Williamson.—I acknowledge it is not improbable; but if on other occasions we are authoritatively informed that such a course was pursued by the tempter, it is not necessary that we should be always told the whole process of every temptation. It has just occurred to me, in corroboration of these remarks, that all God's ministers, whether angels or men, Prophets or Apostles, in executing their various errands with men, have addressed themselves to them by arguments. This being God's way in inclining and inducing men to action, it is not reasonable that he has also a secret and unintelligible way of addressing men's minds in order to give effect to the mode which he has uniformly pursued. Such a double method would only argue the impotency of all that is written in the book—of all the labors of prophets, apostles, and angels, in all their embassies to our race.

Mr. Reed.—It would be still more derogatory to the Spirit which spoke in all these messengers, if it were obliged to adopt a secret method to give efficacy to a public method. It would be making void the latter, and tacitly declaring it wholly inadequate to any good purpose: for without the labors of so many agents, it could have better done the work of persuasion by itself alone, and thus have saved the world from all the frauds which by a written revelation and by the ministry of angels and of men, have been practised upon our race.

Robert Fowler.—Before you dismiss the subject, I must renew my difficulty touching the omnipresence of Satan. How can Satan instigate all the human race at one time to all the evil actions which are ascribed to him?

Mr. Reed.—Satan being the head, commander, and chief of all the evil agents in the universe, it is in strict harmony with universal usage to ascribe to him all that is done by his influence. For example, Cesar, while in Rome, was said to be transacting certain affairs in Germany, in Italy, in Spain, in France, &c. Cesar was doing all these things by his agents; and, in the common sense of all the empire, every thing was ascribed to him. Now as Satan has under him all evil spirits and wicked men, it is in full accordance with the same common sense of mankind, to ascribe to him all that is done by his influence. Thus Satan, like a roaring lion, is represented as going up and down in the earth, seeking whom he may devour.

Mrs. Reed.—Our Divine Master taught his disciples, in an early part of his ministry to pray, "Lead us not into temptation." Now methinks there is a necessity for us to watch and pray that we fall not into temptation.

Mrs. Fowler.—Let me add, sister Reed, that *fasting* still appears to me a necessary accompaniment of watching and prayer. These three, each in its proper place and time, seem well adapted to our circumstances.

We must *watch*, weigh, consider maturely the motives which govern our conduct. We must take heed lest Satan gain any advantage over us; keep our hearts with all diligence; and guard our tongues, which James says are sometimes "set on fire from hell," lest we offend our Lord. Watching is the constant duty in the time of war; while life lasts we are still exposed to the enemy, and therefore it is our duty always to watch.

To *pray* is also necessary to our success. Jacob prevailed by prayer; while the hands of Moses were uplifted and upheld to the skies, Israel prevailed; when, by his side, Amalek prevailed. "Pray always" is an exhortation which shows its utility in waging the holy war.

And why not *fast?* Does not the denial of our most reasonable appetites, the controlling of our lawful desires for food, accustom the mind to endure hardships, practise it in the most noble of all arts, that of self-government? It is easy for the mind, trained to govern the body in its most lawful desires, to keep in subjection all inordinate appetites, to resist temptation; and pardon me if I yet express the conviction that the fasting of the Messiah, after his baptism and before his temptation, was designed as the best preparation for the labors he was about to commence, and the best protection and guard against the power of the enemy.

It is of immense advantage to learn to keep the body under, in order to the elevation of our minds and affections to the heavens. This was not lost sight of by the great Apostle to the Gentiles. "I keep my body under," discloses the secret of his brilliant conquests in his career to glory. We pamper ourselves, and pray for humility and self-denial! Do you not think, brother Reed, that this is inconsistent?

Mr. Reed.—I am convinced that the pampering and continued feasting of the body is a sin against nature and against religion. To fast when persons have no appetite to eat, or nothing to eat, is without moral advantage; but to deny our appetites when we have all the means of indulgence, and the keen desires of nature, in full health and vigor, is quite another matter, and has quite a different effect upon ourselves, especially when that fasting is designed to advance our conformity to the Lord.

Thus fasting, our minds are more acute, our judgments less biassed and oppressed by sense, our hearts better prepared for waiting upon the Lord, and our moral strength renewed and increased. I have not one word to say against fasting; but much to say in its favor. Sister Reed can tell you how much my neighbor, Parson W——, of the Church of England, contended with me for my saying that his Bishop was too fat and well favored to be a Christian. Indeed, I have seen many faces in our religious meetings which I thought looked more like the phiz of the worshippers of Ceres and of Bacchus, than of the

God that is spirit, light, and love. We are ruined on all sides by indulgence; our bodies are worn out by the labors of gormandizing; the machinery of nature is oppressed by the weight of luxury and excess which is imposed upon it, and is prematurely worn out by constant and accumulated action. The mind is enfeebled by these excesses, and becomes the prey of every physical derangement; and the whole man incapacitated for enjoyment of any sort, sensitive, intellectual, or moral.

Father Goodal.—A religion without fasting and the restraint of even our most natural and reasonable appetites, would not be adapted to our whole nature. Fasting is just as necessary to spiritual health as exercise is to our corporeal vigor. In all ages of the world, on all great occasions, seasons of sore trial, times of great calamity, public solemnities, the good and faithful and heavenly-minded of our race gave themselves to fasting and prayer, as means of sanctification or preparation for the labors and trials that were coming upon them. My maxim on this subject, for the last forty years, has been, that occasional fasting is good for both physical and moral health, and constant feasting or indulgence is good for neither.

Mother Goodal.—Well, my dear, you know that I agree with you in all your views of fasting; but really I think, on this New Year's evening, when you have got so many of your friends and relatives around you, it does not come with so good a grace for us to close the evening with a disquisition upon fasting. Does not Solomon say, "There is a time for every thing"? and surely there is a time for Christians to *feast* as well as to *fast*. Are there not '*feasts of love*' as well as times for fasting? Maria, have you forgotten your nuts and figs? I am sure some of the young people would rather see some of these than hear an oration upon fasting.

Mrs. Fowler.—To-morrow evening we hope to see all the present company at my house, and I expect them to come to partake with us in a feast of love. It is not at all repugnant to my views of fasting, (and they are now fairly before the company,) that Christians should feast together from house to house, as well as fast, either publicly or privately, as occasion may require. Our blessed Saviour feasted as well as fasted; and I fully agree with Mother Goodal that there is a time for every thing, and that all things are beautiful in their season. My pressing this matter will, I know, be excused by all present: I will, therefore, only add, that I have yet remaining some other matters which I hope to hear discussed more fully at our house to-morrow evening.

Father Goodal.—Mother Goodal, so full of good nature, and sometimes a little inclined to raillery, has suggested to me that we had better prepare for adjournment and repose. Brother Reed, will you give us a song of thanksgiving?

Mr. Reed.—May we not sing,

"When all thy mercies, O my God,
My rising soul surveys,
Why, my cold heart, art thou not lost
In wonder, love, and praise!"

EDITOR.

Near Braddock's Grave, Oct. 7, 1833.

Baptism for Obedience.

IN this age of improvement and new discovery, it appears that the ramparts and bulwarks around the faith and obedience of the city of our God, reared by the joint effort of Prophets and Apostles, are likely to interpose but a feeble resistance to that bold and enterprizing spirit of invention and innovation, which, in all the pride of false philosophy, alike contemns all things ancient, whether human or divine. To see the advances of this spirit in those establishments which make and treat religion like a human science, and represent the Bible in the light of a text-book, a volume of proofs, is strange enough, and much to be lamented; but how much more to see one who renounces all human creeds, glorying in the name Christian, and boasting in his liberty to reject all human dogmas, speak in the following terms:—

"*October* 9—I left my residence on a tour to Virginia. I commenced my labors, and God stood by me; and his Spirit was abundantly poured out upon the people: and, at my second appointment, in Booth Burkholder's neighborhood, between thirty and forty came forward for prayer, and several found peace; and during my stay eleven respectable members united with the church, and seven were baptized in obedience to the command of the Great Head of the church—but not for the remission of sins.* I think the cause is truly prosperous in that place."

So speaks this Christian preacher. The New Testament is his creed. In this gentleman's Acts of the Apostles, 30th chapter and 60th verse, the following passage is found, which just proves his cause to be apostolic:—

"In those days Peter went down to Azotus, and preached to them the word of the Lord. And the Lord stood by him, and poured out his Spirit upon the unbelievers; insomuch that about forty of them came up to Peter's altar to be prayed for: and, lo! several of these forty found peace there as Peter prayed. While he sojourned among them eleven respectable members of Azotus united with the church; and besides uniting with the church, no less than seven of them were baptized—not for the remission of their sins—but for their obedience to the Lord. For while Peter prayed for them, before they were baptized, they received peace, without any assurance of remission."

With such authority as this before him, our friend Walters may procced with much confidence of success, and with all assurance that he will have the approbation of his Master. But if the above passage should prove to be an interpolation, and that both the 29th and 30th chapters of the Acts have been added by some more modern hand, then our friend will have much difficulty in getting his forty kneeling, his eleven respectable members of Azotus, and his seven immersed for obedience, with the remainder of his peace-enjoying unimmersed for disobedience, into one and the same church triumphant!

*Isaac N. Walters' Journal—from Rev. Clough's Luminary, page 329.

But one thing is clear, beyond all doubt, that Mr. Walters makes no pretensions to be the successor or vicar of Peter; for while Peter bade *every penitent* to be immersed for the remission of his sins, Mr. Walters says, 'Come, be prayed for, every one of you; and if any one choose to be immersed, it must not be for remission, but for the sake of showing that he will do any thing he is commanded, whether it be significant or insignificant of any thing.' EDITOR.

Hillsborough, Pa. October 5, 1833.

Baptism for Renunciation.

MR. CLOUGH, of New York, Editor of the *Gospel Luminary*, has recently discovered that *aphiesis*, translated *remission*, ought at least once to be translated *renunciation*, to relieve him from the difficulty of Peter's commandment to the penitent Jews. To command a person, however penitent, to be baptized for remission, is, in the estimation of this Luminary, "consummate nonsense," if I can recollect his expression. But to command a penitent to be immersed for *renunciation*, is the climax of good sense and reason. He presumes, being a "Greek scholar," to substitute *renunciation* for *remission*, on the authority of himself. This is so perfectly ridiculous, as to put it out of the power of any man to offer a grave reply. A word so well established in the estimation of all men of any pretensions to learning, is not to be now proved by the induction of a hundred quotations to offset Mr. Clough's special will and pleasure.

But will Mr. Clough tell us in plain English what he means by baptism for renunciation alone? Can a penitent renounce sin in no other way than by immersion? If so, he ought to be more zealous to have all penitents immersed, than his system, in other parts of it, requires. Being an organ of the "Christian Sect" of New York, and an advocate for baptism, *if the candidate requires it*, it behoves him to preach its indispensable connexion with the actual renunciation of sin—if, indeed, Peter commanded the believing and penitent Jews to be immersed in order to renunciation.

Perhaps he would take sides with Mr. Lynn of Cincinnati, and would, with this zealous Regular Baptist, prefer a transposition of Peter's words, as well as a new version of "remission." Doctor Lynn would, to suit his views, have it translated so as to make *repentance* the condition of forgiveness. Hence he thinks Peter ought to have said, 'Repent for the remission of your sins, and be baptized every one of you, because you are pardoned, in order to a formal dedication to the Lord—or renunciation of the world, the flesh, and Satan.' The *tears* of repentance are better than all the *waters* of Jordan! But are all penitents pardoned? and how will any penitent know when he is remitted, or when his amount of sorrow for the past, and resolution to amend, will fill up the condition on which remission is granted?

This commandment of Peter greatly confounds these "*Gospel* Luminaries." Not one of them, however, can offer a rational substitute

for it: the Calvinist and the Arminian, the Athanasian and the Arian, the High Church and the *low* church join heart and hand to oppose it; yet, when they have tried every mode of torturing Peter to make him recant, he boldly rejoins, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins." And still more obstinate, in his farewell letter he says, "*Immersion does also now save us*, seeking a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Thus Peter withdraws from the arena of the gladiators.

But could our friends, Lynn and Clough, strangle Peter on the day of Pentecost, how will they do with him in Solomon's Portico? And how will they do with Ananias, to whom Jesus sent Paul for instruction? Will either of the gentlemen say, "And now why do you tarry, Saul, having washed away your sins, be now immersed to renounce them, calling upon the name of the Lord"? Will this *transposition* and *translation* please the Doctors?

A curious book we would have, if these Doctors could be favored with a right to transpose and new-translate every sentence which is opposed to their views.

We would advise our *Christian* friends, Walters and Clough, to come to an agreement on this subject. The former has a "baptism for obedience"—and the latter, for *renunciation;* and, for aught I have seen to the contrary, probably they may coalesce with Mr. Lynn in preaching *repentance* for remission.

We are sorry to see the course pursued by these "no creed New Testament Christians." They have, in *name*, advocated the Bible alone; but in *reality* and in *fact*, they go for all the fooleries of the age. Unless they use the language of Ashdod, with other than the usual ideas attached to it, this is a true saying. I will give a specimen from the July number of the "Luminary," the only one which I have at command here in the mountains of Pennsylvania:—"There the power of God was displayed in a wonderful manner. *Numbers crowded to the mourning bench.*" p. 329. "Let me say to those *deeply anxious for salvation*—you who have crowded to *the anxious seat*, all heaven is in your favor." 345. "Proceedings of the Convention of *Ministers* and LAYMEN of the Christian Connexion, holden in the *Chapel* of the first *Christian Society*, in the City of New York; commencing June 4th, 1833.—The Convention was organized by the appointment of Elder J. S. Thompson, *Chairman*, and J. N. Walter, *Secretary.*" p. 345. "*Resolved*, That each *Local Conference* be entitled to *two delegates;* and for every *ten* ORDAINED MINISTERS, *two* additional *delegates;* and any church of *one hundred members*, not connected with any *Local Conference*, may send *one delegate.*" page 346. And what are all these *delegates* to do? The work of the old, or young man of sin? or what else? These gentlemen talk of "the pure system of Bible Christianity," and cry out for consolidation because they are now no longer "a despised few." "Union is strength." We want "a General Convention." "We believe that by some degree of effort, our friends throughout the country may cause themselves to be generally *represented.*" p. 349.——A church representative! I for-

bear.——Is this the glorious ultimatum of your "liberal Christianity"—of your "no creed, New Testament religion"? I wonder not that these gentlemen are opposed to baptism for remission, and all its correlates. EDITOR.

Wiggins', October 7, 1833.

Bowling Green, Caroline county, Va.

A Hint to the Faithful.

THERE is in all human institutions, whether political or religious, a correspondence to the different periods of human life, with all their attendant circumstances. There are periods in their history as strongly marked as are the states of infancy, childhood, manhood, and old age. When any new religious association starts into life, it commences its march with all the sprightliness and vivacity of youth. Elate and gay, it steps forth upon the theatre of action as if it were beyond the reach of mortality, and feels not in itself one symptom of decay. Sanguine in all its views and feelings, it sees its rivals for public approbation sinking under the weight of years; or imagines that they are so shattered in their constitutions, so enfeebled in their general health, that they cannot long resist the war of elements, but must soon expire under the accumulated force of so many unpropitious circumstances. It soon arrives at manhood; and if its constitution has not yet evinced any weakness, its very vigor (by impelling it to over-exertion) sometimes becomes the occasion, if not the cause, of some irreparable shock, which at length forces upon it the conviction that it too, perchance, may go the way of all the earth, and be yet enrolled amongst the trophies of the King of Terrors.

On entering the ecclesiastic gallery we see a larger group of haggard countenances, in the decline of life, than were ever exhibited there before. They generally appear to have seen their better days, to be bowed down with the weight of cares and years, waiting for their dissolution. Two only in all the group exhibit much vigor, and both are evidently past their meridian.

On surveying the great bodies politic, in the political museum, we are struck with the same alarming prognostics of decline. All the great states are in their dotage, and exhibit the decrepitude of extreme old age. The ancient monarchies, and the once splendid hierarchies, both of the East and of the West, are alike tottering on the brink of the grave. The immediate fall of any one of them would not greatly surprise the survivors. It would be like the demise of an old man who had in common expectation almost fulfilled his day.

There is no hope in their case. The history of all past ages premonishes them of their fate, and the feebleness of their own health confirms their anticipations. The amount of advantage which any of these institutions bestows on man is now clearly ascertained, and more cannot hereafter be expected than has already been realized. We are, therefore, compelled to expect a new order of things if we dare promise

ourselves a larger amount of social happiness than is or can be now enjoyed.

Under our own political and religious institutions we see what an amount of ignorance, crime, and misery exist. In the state what enormous crimes are every day reported; in the church or sectarian establishments, what apathy, indifference, formality, ceremony, and destitution of the power of godliness; what pride, enmity, slander, evil speaking, and injustice; how little of the peace, hope, love, and joy of primitive Christianity! Need we more numerous, more unequivocal, more credible vouchers that the whole head is sick, the whole heart faint, that the whole body is covered with wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores! Shall we then shut our eyes, close our ears, and bless our stars that we are fully happy, and that the measure of our enjoyment fills the promises and verifies all that is to be expected from all that is written of the reign and government of Messiah the Prince of Peace!

What then is to be done? Wait the coming of the Lord, despair of better times, submit to the rulers of the darkness of this world; or shall we fight on, and combat the good combat, in the firm persuasion that our labor in the Lord shall not be fruitless?

Most assuredly this ought to be our unshaken determination. It is the course, the only course which reason and revelation alike approve. It is, moreover, full of promise that will never make us ashamed. We have the gospel, the original gospel—Jesus is our Captain and our King. We have the promises—we have the throne of mercy and favor. We have the approbation of all the saints in heaven—the aid of all the angels of God. We have the prayers of all good men on earth—even those who oppose us ignorantly pray for our success: for we are doing the work which they desire to see done, but have neither the courage nor the knowledge to undertake. Our success is already greatly beyond our expectation. We have tried the temper of the swords of our opponents. There is not a Jerusalem blade in all the armies of the aliens. We shall be more than conquerors if we lose not sight of the ground we have taken—of the cause we have espoused.

Christianity is still the same thing it ever was. We can restore the ancient institutions—we can build up the breaches in the wall—we can remove much of the rubbish—we can find the foundation of the City—and we can begin the glorious work of rebuilding the ruined places. To him who believes the promises all this is possible; but to those who are desponding in Zion all things are impossible.

Desponding belongs to our opponents—not to us. Their abortive efforts to oppose the progress of reform, might teach them the lesson which Jesus condescended from his throne to teach Saul of Tarsus—"*How hard to kick against the goads!*" But they will not learn. Let us, then, learn to fight with patience, with perseverance, the good fight of faith.———I thank God and take courage, in passing over the ground on which a few seeds were scattered, only a few years since, in Eastern Virginia. EDITOR.

New Translation.

A NEW translation of the Testament has been recently published by Rodolphus Dickinson, a Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and Rector of St. Paul's Parish, Pendleton District, South Carolina. The avowed object of this translation is, "to furnish a work better adapted than the old translation to the advanced state of literature and refinement, and correct the errors in grammar and rhetoric, and the harsh and indelicate expressions which are dispersed through the common version." As a specimen of his *improvement*, we copy the following passages from the translation of Mr. Dickinson:—

[*Louisville Herald.*]

"Moreover, there was a Pharisee, whose name was Nicodemus, a senator of the Jews. He came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Teacher, we know that thou art an instructer emanated from God; for no one can achieve these miracles which thou performest unless God be with him. Jesus answered and said to him, Indeed, I assure you, that except a man be reproduced, he cannot realize the reign of God. Nicodemus says to him, How can a man be produced when he is mature? Can he again pass into a state of embryo, and be produced? Jesus replied, I most assuredly declare to you, that unless a man be produced of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is produced from the body is natural life, and that which is produced from the Spirit is spiritual life."

This is a specimen of the euphonistic improvements projected by Dr. Webster. Whether the *folly* or the *presumption* of this project is most to be wondered at, I leave others to decide; but as to the intelligibility, beauty, and delicacy of this style, I have no hesitation in giving a preference to the common version.

1st. As to the delicacy, (which appears the chief object of the translator,) I would ask whether this squeamishness and fastidiousness do not betray more indelicacy of thought than is found in the simple and unaffected language of nature. The prude is more scrupulous and affected than a woman of unsuspected virtue. The over nicety of the former excites suspicion, while the simplicity and artlessness of the latter exhibit a mind unpractised in the arts of deception. If it be indelicate to speak of being born again, it is equally so to speak of being born; and this translator, to be consistent with himself, ought to exclude this word and all its relatives from the Bible. Instead of "Them who are born of woman," he ought to say, 'Of them that are produced by women;' and instead of "Thou shalt not commit adultery," 'Thou shalt not have criminal conversation with a married lady.' But even this is too coarse for a gentleman of such refined taste. It would be better to leave out the commandment altogether than to offend the rules of politeness!

2. As to the beauty of this polite style, it seems in no respect superior to the common version. "Said *unto* him"—"*Achieve* these miracles"—"*Moreover*, there was a Pharisee," &c. are poor emendations as respects beauty and neatness of expression.

3d. But as to intelligibility, the chief consideration, it is far behind the common version. "Realize the reign of God"—"Produced when he is mature"—"Pass into a state of embryo"—"Emanated from God," are more in the style of Plato and the philosophers, than in the style of the common sense of the common people, to whom all attention should be paid. Jesus Christ, who never blushed, never could have spoken in the style of the Rev. Rodolphus Dickinson; for it makes a sinner blush to read it. ED. M. H.

John Adams.

THE following letter from this distinguished revolutionary patriot and sage, to the Rev. Dr. Bancroft, on being presented by the Divine with a volume of his sermons, will be read with interest, not only as the product of his pen, who flourished in our Independence Hall, so successfully, the sword of the Revolution; but as enforcing a great moral duty, which it were well both for clergy and laity to study more effectually to perform. The anecdote with which the letter closes, is admonitory and pointed.

Quincy, January 21, 1823.

Dear Sir—I thank you for your kind letter of the 30th December, and, above all, for the gift of a precious volume. It is a chain of diamonds, set in links of gold. I have never read or heard a volume of sermons better calculated or adapted to the age and country in which it was written. How different from the sermons I heard and read in the town of Worcester, from the year 1755 to 1758! As my destiny in life has been somewhat uncommon, I must beg pardon for indulging in a little egotism. I may say I was born and bred in the centre of theological and ecclesiastical controversy. A sermon of Mr. Bryant, minister of the parish, who lived on the spot, now a part of the farm on which I live, occasioned the controversy between him and Mr. Niles, Mr. Porter, and Mr. Bass, and many others; it broke out like the eruption of a volcano, and blazed with portentous aspect for many years. The death of Dr. Mellen, the Episcopal minister of this town, produced the controversy between Dr. Mayhew and Mr. Apthorp, who were so connected with this town, that they might also be considered inhabitants of it. I may say that my eyes opened upon books of controversy between the parties of Mr. Buckminster and Mr. Mellen. I became acquainted with Dyer, Doolittle, and Baldwin, three notable disputants. Mr. M'Carty, though a Calvinist, was not a bigot; but the town of Worcester was a scene of disputes all the time I was there. When I left, I entered into a scene of other disputations at the bar, and, not long afterwards, disputations of another kind in politics.

In later times I have lived with Atheists, Deists, Sceptics, with Cardinals, Archbishops, Monks, Friars of the Roman Catholic persuasion; with Archbishops, Deans, and Priests of the Church of England; with Farmer, Price, Priestly, Kipps, Rees, Lindsey, Dinsey, and Job,

with the English and Scottish clergy in Holland, and especially with Dr. Macdean at the Hague. I have conversed freely with most of the sects in America, and have not been wholly inattentive to the writings and reasonings of all these denominations of Christians and philosophers. You may well suppose, then, that I had controversy enough; but after all, I declare to you, that your twenty-nine sermons have expressed the result of all my reading, experience, and reflection, in a manner more satisfactory to me than I could have done in the best days of my strength.

The most afflictive circumstances that I have witnessed in the lot of humanity, are the narrow views, the unsocial humors, the fastidious scorn, and repulsive temper of all denominations, excepting one.

I cannot conclude this letter without adding an anecdote. One of the zealous mendicants for the contributions to the funds of Missionary Societies, called on a gentleman in Haverhill, and requested his charity. The gentleman declined subscribing; but added, that there are in and about the town of ——, nine clergyman, ministers of nine congregations, not one of whom lives on terms of civility with any other—will admit none other into his pulpit, nor be permitted to go into the pulpit of any other. Now if you will raise a fund to *convert* these nine clergymen to *Christianity*, I will contribute as much as any other man.——I am, with great esteem, your friend,

JOHN ADAMS.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

Paris, Mo. August 1, 1833.

THE reformation is making considerable progress in this part of Missouri. I have lately baptized thirty upon a confession of faith in Christ.

H. THOMAS.

Roundgrove Prairie, Marion County, Mo. August 29, 1833.

IT is with pleasure I announce to you the fact, that here, in the remote wilds of the West, where, only four years ago, the wild beasts of the forest were seldom or ever alarmed by the voice of civilized man—is a congregation of disciples, in number thirty-three, nine of whom I have immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of their sins, within the last six weeks. One more has confessed, but not obeyed. The subject of the weekly breaking of the loaf is now before us for consideration. The harvest here is truly great, and the laborers are not only few, but do not fully possess the qualifications requisite for reformers; yet they are zealous in the good cause, and will do all they can to promote it. We should be glad if some of our brethren, more able to teach than ourselves, would visit us.

EASTHAM BALLINGER.

CALLOWAY COUNTY, Mo. September 15, 1833.

AMONGST the numerous accounts you hear of the progress of the reformation, permit me to add, we are still endeavoring to press forward in the service of our King. We number at this time 28; and although great pains are taken by our opponents to prejudice the minds of the people against us, still we find some have the moral courage to come out boldly and confess the good confession, and be immersed for the remission of their sins.

ABSALOM RICE.

SWEDEN, Monroe county, N. Y. September 17, 1833.

PRESUMING that the letter I wrote you in May last has not been received, I take my pen again in hope that this may meet with a safe arrival. In my last I gave some account of the progress of reform in this region, and the anathemas, excommunications, and slanders which are hurled against its advocates. I shall not now repeat them. There are four of us who bore the name of Free-Will Baptists, that are now proclaiming the ancient gospel; and though we have almost every thing to contend against, we find that the "truth is mighty, and," we doubt not, "will prevail." Brother Thomas has the consolation of having with him a considerable number of the church in Batavia, of which he was Pastor, and has also immersed these, and in the vicinity ten others for the remission of sins.

J. M. YEARNSHAW.

COLEMANSVILLE, Harrison Co. Ky. September 18, 1833.

SINCE my last communication to you, I have baptized and received into membership upwards of fifty persons, (besides attending to my practice, which has been considerable.) These have been chiefly in and near the neighborhood where I reside. The sword of the Spirit, when wielded in its plain and simple style, stript of all human dogmas, will as surely convert sectarians and sinners, as Jesus reigns in heaven; and if all were to read Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, and believe the four first verses of the 15th chapter, there would be but one Lord, one faith, one baptism. WM. WALTERS.

CREELSBOROUGH, Russell Co. Ky. September 23, 1833.

KNOWING that you are at all times truly gratified at hearing the progress of the ancient gospel, I now take the pleasure and liberty to inform you of the success it has met with in our section of country.

On Saturday and Sunday, the 24th and 25th days of August last, brother John Steele visited us, and before he left nineteen confessed the Lord, and were immersed for the remission of sins.

The Friday, Saturday, and Lord's day following, brothers John Steele, W. D. Jourdan, and John Mulkey proclaimed the gospel at Burksville, Kentucky; twenty-two there made the good confession, and put on the Lord by immersion.

Brother Steele again attended at this place on yesterday and the day before. Twenty-six more were immersed in the name of the Lord, and nineteen Baptist brethren came forward and united with us. The congregation at this place now numbers fifty-four members.

When brother Steele visited us, four weeks since, there were but four persons in the neighborhood who believed in the doctrines of the reformation. A large majority of those who confessed the Lord at this place, were young persons, just in the prime of life.

Yours in the bonds of Christian unity, hoping for a meeting in the eternal world of bliss and immortality. P. W. DRYDEN.

Bath County, Ky. September 26, 1833.

WE had a four days meeting at Upper White Oak, a few weeks ago; at which place a number of disciples met, with a large concourse of people. Great harmony prevailed throughout the meeting. Between forty and fifty made the good confession; many more were very much shaken. Such a shaking of the dry bones of Calvinism I have never seen. Brother Smith exhibited the word each day, who is indeed himself a host. Our church constituted with eighteen members, five years ago. We now number about one hundred and twenty. We take the Book for our rule.

TH. T. SWETNAM.

Murfreesborough, Tenn. October 1, 1833.

I WILL now proceed to give you a brief account of the progress of reformation in this part of Tennessee. The last week in August I went to Franklin: while gone about twenty were immersed, and five intelligent Baptists met us on the Book. The first Lord's day in September we had a meeting at Berea, in this county, where thirty-three were immersed. The next week I went to Nashville, where I had the happiness of seeing nineteen buried. The third Sunday there was a meeting near Lebanon, and the fourth at Alexandria. Twenty were immersed at each place.

But one of the most interesting meetings we have had was in the town of Franklin, where brother Adams, myself, and some other brethren spent a part of last week. We commenced proclamation there on Tuesday evening, and continued till Saturday morning, 10 o'clock. The sects opposed us with their most puissant weapon, which was to keep as many of their admirers from hearing us as they could. To effect this the Baptists and Methodists had meeting every day and night during our stay; though notwithstanding their opposition, we had crowded and intelligent congregations all the time. We immersed seventeen for remission. And on Saturday morning some of the citizens of town assembled with us at the Masonic Hall to see if it were possible for a church to be formed on the word of God. There, for the first time, did they see sixteen intelligent disciples give themselves to each other to worship according to the Apostles' teaching. After we congratulated the saints we departed. They promised to meet the next day, at the house of brother Anderson, to attend to the ancient order. May the Lord bless the brethren there!

Our congregation in Murfreesborough is still increasing. I look for better times. May all the saints increase in favor and the knowledge of the Scriptures! Amen!

TOLBERT FANNING.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, Ky. October 3, 1833.

THE gospel which we preach is still successful in bringing many poor sinners into the kingdom of the Lord Jesus amongst us. While the cholera has swept of many, others have taken the alarm, and many have turned to the Lord by seeking a pure heart, a clean conscience, and a clean body. Thus they can draw near to God in full assurance of faith. I attended with brothers Herney and M'Call at a new meeting house in Shelby county, on the first Lord's day in September, where a church was constituted, consisting of nearly forty disciples, fifteen or twenty of whom had been baptized through the summer—the others from the Baptist churches in the neighborhood. They seem determined to walk in the footsteps of the ancient flock.

At Flat Rock Church about sixty have been immersed within a short time past. Some have been added to the other churches around, to the amount of nearly one hundred. Blessed be the Lord for his mercy, for all good things are of God!

On last Monday I was sent for to immerse a lady, the wife of Dr. Murray. When I arrived I found her sick in bed, and a good number of the brethren and neighbors called together. She declared her faith in the Lord Jesus, and her desire to obey him. A bath of water was prepared near the bed, in which I immersed her; after which a table was prepared with bread and wine, at her request, and she united with us in breaking the loaf. It was truly a solemn and impressive scene. I learned that just before she had been taken sick, she had been reading the Extra on Reformation. I am sorry I have not a hundred of them to give to my neighbors.

May the God of Elijah be ever your God while contending with the Prophets of Baal!

Yours in the faith and hope,

B. ALLEN.

NASHVILLE, Tenn. October, 4, 1833.

THE cause of truth is prospering in this town and vicinity. We have immersed about ninety persons since the middle of June last, among whom are many of our most respectable citizens. I seldom fail going into the river twice in a week, and sometimes more frequently.

Our Methodist brethren have immersed a great many here this summer. Not long since, when we repaired to the river, we had to wait until they were done immersing. The two congregations formed a handsome scene on the banks of the river.

Brother Fanning and myself attended a four days' meeting last week in Franklin, Williamson county. Sixteen persons confessed the Lord, and were immersed into his name. A congregation of 16 members was organized before we left them. The Methodists and Baptists held meetings constantly during our stay; yet the independence of the people prompted them to hear for themselves.

A. ADAMS

Rocks of Lake Superior.

UPON the southern coast of Lake Superior, about fifty miles from the Falls of St. Mary, are the immense precipitous cliffs, called by the voyagers, Le Pottrail and the Pictured Rocks. This name has been given them in consequence of the different appearance which they present to the traveller, as he passes their base in his canoe. It requires little aid from the imagination to discern in them the castellated tower and lofty dome, spires and pinnacles, and every sublime, grotesque, or fantastic shape which the genius of architecture ever invented. These cliffs are an unbroken mass of rocks, rising to an elevation of 300 feet above the level of the lake, and stretching along the coast for fifteen miles. The voyagers never pass this coast except in the most profound calm; and the Indians, before they make the attempt, offer their accustomed oblations, to propitiate the favor of their Monitas. The eye instinctively searches along this eternal rampart for a single place of security; but the search is in vain. With an impassable barrier of rocks on one side, and an interminable expanse of water on the other, a sudden storm upon the lake would as inevitably insure destruction of the passenger in his frail canoe, as if he were on the brink of the cataract of Niagara. The rock itself is sandstone, which is disentegrated by the continual action of the water with comparative facility. There are no broken masses upon which the eye can rest and find relief. The lake is so deep, that these masses, as they are torn from the precipice, are concealed beneath its waves until they are reduced to sand. The action of the waves has undermined every projecting point: and there the immense precipice rests upon arches, and the foundation is intersected with caverns in every direction.

When we passed this immense fabric of nature the wind was still, and the lake was calm. But even the slightest motion of the waves, which, in the most profound calm, agitates these internal seas, swept through the deep caverns with the noise of distant thunder, and died away upon the ear as it rolled forward in the dark recesses, inaccessible to human observation. No sound more melancholy or more awful ever vibrated upon human nerves. It has left an impression which neither time nor distance can ever efface. Resting in a frail bark canoe upon the limpid waters of the lake, we seemed almost suspended in air, so pellucid is the element upon which we floated. In gazing upon the towering battlements which impended over us, and from which the smallest fragment would have destroyed us, we felt, intensely, our own insignificance. No situation can be imagined more appalling to the courage, or more humbling to the pride of man. We appeared like a speck upon the face of creation. Our whole party, Indians and voyagers, and soldiers, officers, and servants contemplated in mute astonishment the awful display of creative power, at whose base we hung; and no sound broke upon the ear to interrupt the ceaseless roaring of the waters. No splendid cathedral, no temple built by human hands, no pomp of worship, could ever impress the spectator with such humility, and so strong a conviction of the immense distance between him and the Almighty Architect. [GOV. CASS.]

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number XI.——Volume IV.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. November, 1833.

New Version and Dr. Cleland.

NO. IV.

THE chief objection urged by the Doctor against the new version, is the liberty which we have taken in uniformly translating *baptizo*, I IMMERSE—and *baptisma*, IMMERSION. This is enough to condemn the work as sectarian and heretical; and on this account it is deservedly exposed to the reprobation of every Paidobaptist in America. Of all this we were but too fully apprized before we presumed to be uniform. The popularity of the version required us not to translate, but to follow James' Bible in anglicising, rather than in translating these words; but Conscience said, 'Translate rather than adopt a word which has been so long a bone of controversy.' We have done so; and just as far as the new version obtains, the controversy about the action of baptism ceases: nay, all who adopt the common version as preferable to the old, must inevitably become Baptists. This cannot be avoided. And the Doctor, foreseeing this, is enraged at the book. We are sorry for this; but what could we do in the case?

We could not translate these words to suit the Doctor's views, for the following reasons:—

1. The King's translator's themselves dared not do it; for although Paidobaptists *themselves*, and preferring sprinkling to any other action, they never dared once to translate it *sprinkle*. Now could they have found any authority, ancient or modern, to countenance them, they would, doubtless, on some occasion, have translated it by the word *sprinkle* or *pour*. They could not, it is true, thus translate it in reference to the institution of baptism, because of the King's instructions; but in some other place, or in reference to something else than

this institution, they might, once or twice, at least, have so translated it! But they did not. How, then, could Dr. Cleland expect us to translate this word *sprinkle* or *pour*, when the royal translators, his own friends and brethren in the faith of sprinkling, did not do it?

2. The King, either conscious that if the word were translated, the rite of sprinkling must fall to the ground; or, unwilling to decide a controversy pending between some of his liege subjects, ordered it to be *retained*, and not translated, in common with all the *ecclesiastic* words of this character.

3. The ablest critics, historians, and antiquarians among the Paidobaptists and administrators of sprinkling, have conceded that *immersion* is the meaning of the word *baptisma*, and that such was the practice of the ancient and primitive church.

4. The authors of the version, Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, so far as they remark upon the original, are decidedly in favor of *immersion* as the meaning of the original.*

5. We are as certain that *immersion* is the meaning of the word BAPTISMA, and the action which Christ commanded, as we are that PISTIS signifies *faith;* ELPIS, *hope;* or AGAPE, *love*—that Jesus is the Messiah, or that the word *gospel* means good news. Why, then, should we not be as uniform in translating these words as any other words in the volume?

But, says Dr. Cleland, Dr. Campbell was too hasty and too superficial in his examination of this question, and erred in deciding in favor of immersion. [I cannot quote his words, as I now write in Essex county, Va. and have not a copy of his essays before me. The preceding censure, however, is not more than the full import of his accusations against Dr. George Campbell.] Many a daring pupil has imputed error to his teacher, when the fault lay in his own stupidity. But this is not the case with our critic. He says this rather to serve his purpose. He knows as well as he knows his own name, if he ever read the Doctor's Notes and Dissertations, that he was not a man of this stamp. His translation and notes lay by him and mellowed for thirty years.

But what will our reviewer and critic say of Professor Stuart? Has he not examined the matter gravely, fully, ably? And what are the results of his criticisms? I ask not for his *opinions*—we know what these are: yet with all his leanings to infant sprinkling, what does he say as a scholar and a critic? Need I inform the Doctor that he affirms that *baptizo* in classic use, in sacred use, in common usage, in all Greek writers signifies to dip, immerse, or plunge, and that he can find no exception to this version to it in any Greek author now in existence? Professor Stuart is worth a hundred Baptist witnesses in such a question as this. Have we not, then, all the learned critics in the world on our side of this question, down to Anno Domini 1833!

Once more on the subject of our authority for uniformity in translating these words: let me ask, Does not all Christendom, Catholic and Protestant, agree that a person *immersed* is baptized? Most certainly

*See the extracts from their works, *Appendix, new version, No. 4.*

this is the catholic faith in Rome, England, America. But do all the Christian world agree that sprinkling is *baptism?* No—far from it. Ought we not, then, to give that version of the word which expresses the sense of all Christendom, rather than a sectarian meaning, which would suit only a part of the Christian profession?

These are our reasons for uniformly rendering these words as we have done; and if better reasons can be given for uniformly rendering any other word in the Old or New Testament, we know not where to find them.

I am, indeed, sorry that we have a word in the New Testament which many professors are afraid to see in English. I am not to blame for this; yet I must regret that so unpropitious a circumstance should stand in the way of the general reception of a version which we think so much more clearly, intelligibly, and forcibly exhibits the communications of the Spirit of God to sinners and to saints.

Now what would Dr. Cleland have done in this case? He would not have translated it *sprinkle*, for this would have ruined his character: he would not have translated it *immerse*, for this would have ruined his practice. What then? He would not have translated it at all, but have left it in the Greek for every one to quarrel about!

Is this controversy ever to terminate? If it is destined to come to an end, the sooner the better: and nothing, we imagine, will so expedite such a desirable issue as the course we have pursued. All the Christian world believe that an immersed believer is baptized—only a part, that a sprinkled person is baptized. This part is daily growing less; for "great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and must prevail!"

EDITOR.

Professor Stuart on the Mode of Baptism.

NO. VI.

THE attempt by our Professor to show that in Romans vi. 4, 5. and in Col. ii. 12. there is no allusion to the action of baptism, astounds me more than any thing I have seen from his pen. In reading his translation and commentary on the Romans, I was, indeed, sorry to see so meagre a criticism, so pointless and so spiritless a disquisition on a portion of this epistle, so significant and instructive; and now to see it amended (and, indeed, made the worse for mending) in a new publication, and relied on to show that a person can die, be buried, and rise again without air, water, or earth—astonishes me still more. But we shall let him tell his own story in his own words:—

"Most commentators have maintained that *sunetaphemen* has here a necessary reference to the mode of literal baptism, which, they say, was by immersion; and this, they think, affords ground for the employment of the image used by the Apostle, because immersion (under water) may be compared to burial (under earth.) It is difficult, perhaps, to procure a patient rehearing for this subject, so long regarded by some as being out of fair dispute. Nevertheless, as my own convic-

tion is not, after protracted and repeated examinations, accordant here with that of commentators in general, I feel constrained briefly to state my reasons.

"The first is, that in the verse before us there is a plain *antithesis:* one so plain that it is impossible to overlook it. If now *sunetaphemen* is to be interpreted in a physical way, i. e. as meaning baptism in a physical sense, where is the corresponding physical idea in the opposite part of the anithesis or comparison? Plainly there is no such physical idea or reference in the other part of the antithesis. The resurrection there spoken of, is entirely a moral, or spiritual one; for it is one which Christians have already experienced, during the present life; as may be fully seen by comparing vers. 5, 11, below. I take it for granted, that after *hemeis*, in verse 4, *egerthentes* is implied; since the nature of the comparison, the preceding *ois egerthe christos*, and verse 5, make this entirely plain.

"If we turn now to the passage in Col. ii. 12. (which is altogether parallel with the verse under examination, and has very often been agitated by polemic writers on the subject of baptism,) we shall there find more conclusive reason still, to argue as above respecting the nature of the antithesis presented, "We have been buried with (Christ) by baptism." What now is the opposite of this? What is the kind of resurrection from this grave in which Christians have been buried? The Apostle tells us, "We have risen with him (Christ) by faith wrought by the power of God who raised him from the dead." Here there is a resurrection by faith, that is, a *spiritual, moral* one. Why, then, should we look for a physical meaning in the antithesis? If one part of the antithesis is to be construed in a manner entirely *moral*, or *spiritual*, why should we not construe the other in like manner?"—— Thus the reader has the Professor fairly before him.

To this I shall offer but two objections. And, first, there is here a perfect antithesis—there are ideas physical and moral, perfectly correspondent in the antithesis; and, therefore, it is not liable to the Professor's objections at all. So it appears to me. We shall now try it.

Jesus Christ was buried and raised literally. In baptism we are physically buried in the water, and physically raised out of the water by the operator. The moral meaning of which is, we having died to sin, mentally and morally, are laid in the watery grave. "*The body of sins*" is there buried, and there we leave our corruptions. We are also morally raised—our state is changed, exalted; and our minds elevated to things in the heavens. Again, we have in this a pledge that as we are buried by immersion into Christ's death, we shall be literally raised and glorified by him at his coming. The antithesis is perfect; for as is the *burial*, so is the *resurrection*—burial in the earth, resurrection from the earth, in the case of Christ—burial in the water, resurrection out of the water physically in this institution—burial of our sins or corruptions, and resurrection to a new life in our state and feelings—immersion into Christ by faith, resurrection with Christ by faith. I feel nothing in the Professor's objections, but see in the Apos-

tle's antithesis all propriety and fitness. As is the burial, so is the resurrection, literally, physically, figuratively.

But my second objection to the Professor's reasonings and criticisms is, that he places himself in the awkward predicament of one making a shadow without a body!! He will have some shadowy moral *burial* and *resurrection;* but there must be nothing like a burial or a resurrection seen in figure, shape, or reality. Whoever before thought of a shadow without a substance? How can a person be buried and raised in baptism, in a figure, or in reality, physically or morally, when there is no symbol, figure, or action indicative of such a thing; but something indicative of the contrary? Can the Professor think of burying and raising an infant while he is bedewing its forehead; or can it think of a burial and resurrection while it feels the cold sweat upon its forehead?

Jesus before his crucifixion confessed before Pontius Pilate that he was the Messiah. He was then killed, buried, raised, and finally ascended up into heaven. We confess Jesus to be the Messiah, die with him to sin, crucify the flesh, are buried with him in immersion, rise with him in state, and ascend with him in our affections. "If you, then, be raised with Christ, set your affections on things above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God." The antithesis, or comparison, is all in good keeping, natural, and well defined.

I am, indeed, sorry to see our Professor so dim-sighted here, and so eagle-eyed in discovering a death to sin and a new life to righteousness in the rite of infant sprinkling! But he will say, that there is no allusion to any "mode of baptism" in Romans vi. This will be creating a still greater difficulty; for how could the Apostle say, "We are buried with him by baptism," and have no allusion to the institution? Having named the institution, he must have thought of it; and he could not think of it without the idea of *the action* by which it was performed.

The Professor appears to me to "labor for that which is not bread." He would have a verbal antithesis, such as, 'We are buried with him by immersion, and raised with him by *emersion;*' whereas the Apostle never speaks in this style. Immersion with him implies the emersion; for it suggests the whole idea to the mind of the hearer. We all say, there is a likeness to a burial and a resurrection in immersion. The Apostle refers to the *thing*, and the Professor is concerned for the *word*. The whole picture was before the mind of the Apostle, and only the first part of it before the mind of the critic; therefore, he cannot find the comparison. He sees no antithesis without the word *emersion*.

If possible I am still more surprized to find the Professor representing the phrase, "By the faith of the operation of God," (Col. i. 12.) as if *energeias* was the dative case. He translates it, "We have risen with him by faith wrought by the power of God." This is, indeed, a *new* version, and must certainly be an oversight. It reads literally, "We have risen with Christ by faith of the power of God, raising him (Christ) from the dead." Because we are raised by faith in this power

of God, follows it, then, that there can be no allusion here to the action of baptism--because we have *immersion* without *emersion* in the text!

This oversight in translating *energeias* as an adjective in the dative case, while it is a substantive in the genitive, I place in the same chapter with his use of the terms "*mode of baptism.*" It cannot be that the Professor ever thought of the sophistry of this phrase; for surely a more perfect sophism in a single word is not to be found. To talk of the mode of immersion by sprinkling; or of the mode of sprinkling by immersion, is so palpable that any one may see the trick that is played upon the Baptists by the Paidobaptists. But with the word *baptism* the term *mode* may be passed off without making the cheat so glaring. When the Baptist consents to talk of the *mode* of baptism, he gives up the debate; for he concedes that the Paidobaptists may have one mode, and he another, of the same *action.* The *sprinklers* ingeniously and silently thus take half the ground without a struggle. One may talk of the mode of immersion when the question is, whether the candidate is to be immersed forwards or backwards; but never when the question is, Must he be sprinkled or immersed? EDITOR.

Essex, Va. October 19, 1833.

Conversation at Mr. Fowler's.

FATHER GOODAL and all the family circle at Newton Fields, having assembled at the residence of Mr. Fowler, the second evening of the New Year; and being all seated in the parlor, after the usual inquiries and compliments of the evening, Mrs. Fowler observed that she was under a promise to some of the present company to have the subject of *Christian education* descanted on during the evening; but she would leave it to Mr. Reed or Father Goodal to say at what time of the evening it might be most seasonably and profitably introduced.

Mr. Reed.—I shall refer it to Father Goodal.

Father Goodal.—I am of opinion it deserves the first place, and shall therefore recommend that it be made the order of the evening, till discussed to the satisfaction of all the company.

Mr. Williamson.—To this proposition and motion I most gladly assent; for this was a theme on which my father and Dr. M, of New York, had many a debate around the fire. In consequence of these discussions I was left in doubt about the whole matter, and have not yet had my doubts resolved on some subjects which are connected with family education.

Mr. Fowler.—I, too, am not fully satisfied that we are in the proper track as respects our practice in our families; and I know my good companion has a special reference to our frequent conversations on *family* education, for this is what she means by Christian education.

Mrs. Fowler.—Christian education with me, I confess, has special reference to the training of our children, in our own family relations; but I have no objection to have the subject viewed in all its bearings

and departments—if so be, that we may be induced to attend more specially to the subject.

Father Goodal.—My daughter Fowler has somewhat improved upon my plans. With her attainments in this science I am well pleased; for I desire that all my children may improve on my theory, and practice too, in this most essential of all things to the happiness of society. I had to depart from the customs of my fathers and contemporaries in order to acquit my conscience; and, therefore, could not object to my children for carrying their views and their practice to greater perfection than myself. Family training is of the most vital importance to both the church and the world. If children are brought up according to the Christian religion, they are generally not only a comfort to their parents, but an honor to the state and a blessing to the church.

Mr. Reed.—Of one thing we have too much testimony and experience—that when children are neglected by their parents, and suffered to grow up like the wild ass's colt, they most frequently become public nuisances and pests to society. Of so much importance is Christian education, that I am surprized that I myself and all my contemporaries should have so much neglected to expatiate upon it. It seems to me now, that as the subject crowds into my mind, it has not received a tenth part of the attention due to it. Sister Fowler, where shall we begin?

Mrs. Fowler.—My husband thinks that I am rather an ultraist on this subject, because I affirm that God has put it in our power to save our children by giving us the New Testament and the promises found in it. Indeed, it appears to me that it was a matter of course amongst the Apostles' converts, to expect all the children born to Christian parents to be added to the Lord, and made members of his church.

Father Goodal.—My daughter, I presume, intends that we should go into this question with spirit; and, therefore, takes an alarming position to excite our interests, and to call forth our energies upon this subject.

Mrs. Fowler.—Alarming! My dear father, would you think it an *alarming* thing that God had bestowed such grace upon us poor sinners, as to give us power to save ourselves and our children?

Father Goodal.—Alarming? Yes, alarming in relation to the doctrines of grace as taught in our catechisms It would, indeed, be alarming to many of our good Divines to hear one talk of *saving* himself and his children. Perhaps it is even alarming to brother Reed to hear you talk thus of saving your children.

Mr Reed.—Sister Fowler and I have talked this matter over more than once before; and when she explains herself I am quite reconciled to her use of this term.

Mr. Williamson.—I never heard such language before. I have been taught that God alone can save us from our sins. What, then, means our saving one another?

Mrs. Fowler.—In the language of the pulpit, and of the books of our ancestors, I know that such expressions are not usual nor tolerable.

But when I hear Paul say, "Timothy, take heed to yourself and to your doctrine, or manner of teaching; for in so doing you shall both save yourself, and them who hear you"—I feel justified in this boldness. And again, says Paul of himself, "If by any means I may *save* some of them"—"I become all things to all men, that by all means I may *save* some." James also says, "He that converts a sinner from the error of his way shall *save* a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins." Peter, moreover, said to the Jews, "*Save* yourselves from this untoward generation." According to these, and similar expressions which I catch from the lips and pens of the Apostles, although I may offend against the style of our contemporaries, I do not offend against the style of God's approved servants, when I talk of *saving* myself and my children.

Mr. Williamson.—Is not this spoken of themselves *instrumentally?*

Mrs. Fowler.—Yes; *instrumentally.* And thus I use the term. It is only instrumentally that we can do any thing in the great work of saving any person. But will Mr. Williamson please to consider, that an instrument is very essential to the execution of any purpose; and sometimes, without it, the best designs fail of accomplishing any thing? It is something, then, of importance to be the instruments of salvation to our relatives and acquaintance. Ought we not to be ambitious of such high honor?

Mr. Reed.—Sister Fowler's style is sound enough in the old sanctuary style, but not in our synagogue style. We shall, then, allow her this liberty, especially at home; but I think it would not be expedient thus to speak in the audience of some very orthodox spirits, lest they should think we dishonored Christ, and robbed him of his glory.

Mr. Williamson.—In this acceptation I will not object. But let me ask, how will parents set about this great work of saving their children?

Mr. Reed.—This is just the subject on hand. Christian education has this for its supreme object. And as Christian parents possess full as much natural affection as any other parents, one would think that it is just enough for them to know that God expects them to do their duty to their children.

Mr. Williamson.—But have they any promise that God will bless such efforts, or make them avail to the salvation of their children?

Mr. Reed.—If we admit Solomon to be a witness in the case, he teaches us to expect the blessing—"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

Father Goodal.—I have generally inferred the promise from the command—"Bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," because God has given no commandment in the keeping of which a blessing does not ensue.

Mrs. Fowler.—David, the father of Solomon, teaches us the reason why God commanded the fathers of the Jewish state to teach their children the revelations of God, and his past providences towards that people. This reason is, in my judgment, equivalent to a promise. The passage I cannot now fully quote. Maria, will you repeat it?

Maria Goodal.—It is in the 78th Psalm:—"What our fathers have told us we will not hide from our children, showing to the generation to come the praises of the Lord and his strength, and his wonderful works that he has done: for he established a testimony in Jacob and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers that they should make them known to their children, that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children, that they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments; and might not be like their fathers, a rebellious race."

Mrs. Fowler.—From these intimations I would infer that it was understood that the communicating of the knowledge of God to children, by their parents, was generally to terminate in their putting their trust in God.

Mr. Reed.—May we not safely conclude, that when God has commanded any thing to be done, it is his intention to connect with obedience a corresponding blessing? This is Father Goodal's idea, and it is mine. "In keeping of all his precepts there is a great reward."

Mr. Williamson.—I have often looked with surprize at the singular zeal of some of our good Missionary folks. They seem to have more affection for those who live on the opposite side of the globe, than for those whom God has put under their care.

Mrs. Fowler.—While I sympathize with every human being enveloped in Pagan darkness, and would like to see the gospel carried to the ends of the earth, I cannot but suspect the Christian sanity of that mind, busied in devising ways and means for converting the heathen abroad, while his own children are perishing under his own roof.

Mrs. Reed.—If *charity should begin at home* on any occasion, this is that occasion. For surely the addition of the yearnings of nature to the calls of religion weakens not the authority of the latter.

Mrs. Fowler.—Indeed, he that hears the calls of the people in the islands of the Pacific, and regards not the cries of his own children, is certainly deaf to the voice of God, and the plaintive demands of nature.

Mr. Reed.—I have this excuse for many of my good friends who are engaged in the Missionary cause. They are generally Calvinists. They think that if God has willed the salvation of their sons and daughters, their friends and neighbors, the means are at hand, and they can be saved.

Mr. Williamson.—But if he have willed the salvation of any of the Otaheitans the means not being sent thither, he cannot accomplish their salvation! And so these good Christians are only solicitous that the means may be every where, that if God wills the salvation of the Pagans, it may be practicable!

Mr. Reed.—Something like that, Mr. Williamson, I must confess, is their view of this subject.

Father Goodal.—I am of the opinion that many good people are less attentive to the Christian education of their children through the force of this sentiment, that neither they nor their children can do any

thing in this matter till God's appointed time be come. And if God have not an appointed time for visiting them with his grace, then all instructions and toils are in vain. In my younger days I have even heard this urged as an excuse for this great neglect on the part of professing parents, when they have been urged to the duty.

Mr. Williamson.—I own that there are not a few among my acquaintance, who yet think it is like taking the work out of God's hand, to talk of their converting or saving their children.

Robert Fowler.—The Rev. Mr. Black, the other day, while reprobating the impiety of those who think they can convert their children or domestics, in order to ridicule such pretensions, told of one of George Whitfield's converts. 'While Mr. Whitfield,' said he, 'was passing down the country he saw a man lying drunk in the mire, and fast asleep. Mr. Whitfield approached the man, awoke him, raised him up, and began to address him. The drunkard, on recovering his senses, said, "I know you full well, Mr. Whitfield; you are a very good man, sir; you converted me about two years ago."——Stop, stop,' said Mr. Whitfield, '*I converted you!* Something like my bungling work! If the *Lord* had converted you, you would not have been lying here!'

Mr. Reed.—Many a man has been laughed out-of his duty by such ridiculous tales. *If the* LORD *had converted!* Does not the Lord do what his own means do? I presume Paul would admit that the Lord converted all whom he saved.

Mrs. Fowler.—I do not think there is any pertinency or force in all these reasonings and objections. With me the command of Paul to parents concerning the education of children, or the bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is positive proof of its practicability. I do hope, then, we shall all agree upon its practicability, and will proceed to consider how it may best be done.

EDITOR.

Essex county, Va. October 18, 1833.

Catholic Controversy.

No. I.

THIS is one of the most important controversies of this controversial age. Important in all its bearings upon the Catholic religion, the Protestant religion, and the *Christian* religion, it cannot fail to interest all religious men. Important, too, in its bearings upon the political destinies of this nation, involving the fundamental principles of free government, and placing again in a new attitude before the public mind, the question, Whether it is possible for any earthly government to exist, under which men's political and religious rights and privileges can be kept perfectly separate and distinct—it demands the attention of all political men.

I have been, in a great measure, a silent spectator of the varied, ingenious, persevering, and bold efforts of the Romanists to gain the political ascendancy in this country. We have only once or twice,

in a public way, called the attention of our contemporaries to this subject. We have expressed the conviction, without giving the proof, that there is, on the part of the Roman See, a settled determination, accompanied with a lively expectation of success—a fixed purpose, from which "His Holiness" is never to depart, to bring these United States into the bosom of the Catholic Church, and to add all America, North and South, to the territory of its dominions. Nor is this project so chimerical as many suppose; nor so implausible as many Romanists in America would have the Protestants to imagine. I am of opinion that it is practicable, if the Romanists can persuade our people that they have no such objects nor wishes; and especially practicable, if the present constitution, and manners and customs of sectarianism continue for a generation or two. Already 40,000 Jesuits, we are informed, are silently and secretly at work in the bosom of our country. Priests have been shipped annually to this country, and landed in small groups at every seaport from Quebec to New Orleans, to avoid suspicion. Large sums of money have been advanced from the coffers of St. Peter to found schools, colleges, and churches in these United States. These schools are, in numerous instances, made so acceptable to our fashionable Protestants and philosophic Sceptics, that they prefer them to any Protestant schools for the education of their children. Many distinguished citizens, at this time, like our Virginia Governor (Floyd,) have their children educated under the auspices of the Pope in Catholic schools. Catholic emigrants, in the ratio of three to one Protestant, are now crowding to our shores. Only two years ago some unwary Catholics boasted that it was known at Rome that 700,000 Catholics were in the United States, and that their church was then more powerful and influential in America than any other. With all these documents before our minds, shall we hesitate to say, that things are in rapid progress to such a consummation. Do we not now see, that even in our cities of New York and Philadelphia, the Catholic priesthood have the boldness to provoke controversy, and to challenge the investigation of their principles; and still more recently it is proposed to have various presses established in America for the purpose of making proselytes to the Catholic faith. Think not, then, courteous reader, that our fears have got the better of our judgment, when we express the conviction, that measures, numerous and efficient, are being taken to bring all America into the Church of Rome.

"Where will the Methodists be," said a Protestant to a Catholic, not long since, who dared to talk a little in this way—"what will our half million of Methodists be engaged about in those days?" "Methodists!" said the Priest, "Methodists! Why—their clergy are as independent of the people—as monarchical as ours! Many of them will fall into our views. No sect would I rather see *go ahead* than the Methodists. Their clergy will make excellent Priests! We have Jesuits now among the Methodist clergy. They are not known as such, it is true. We become all things to all men, that by all means we may gain some. Never mind—God bless the Methodists!"

"And what will the Baptists, the half million of Baptists be doing in those days?" "What they are doing now—fighting about their creeds and their opinions. A feeble band—more than twenty sorts of them, and no one of them has an efficient ministry! They have not much concert, and they have few learned and talented men. Bless your soul! immersion travels slowly in cold weather!"

"But are not the Episcopalians learned and united?" "Yes; and did not *three* of their most learned clergy, in New York, come over in one body to our Catholic church, a few years since? Even in England, good Old England, were it not for the Establishment———I will not say it. They are better paid than our clergy, a hundred per cent. There is but a paper wall between us and them!——I wish the Episcopalians were more numerous in America!"

Thus some of the more simple-minded of the Catholics talk, as a gentleman informed me the other day in King & Queen.

There is another point of view in which this Catholic controversy becomes interesting to myriads of our citizens. A cause is now plead by some, called *a Reformation*, more characteristically *the Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things*, or of primitive Christianity, in sentiment and practice. This cause, for which many now plead, and to which we have been devoted for many years, contemplates Popery and Protestantism, in its hundred forms, though widely differing from each other, as falling far short of Christianity, properly so called. Neither Popery, nor that reformation of it called Protestantism, in our judgment, exhibits, either in faith or practice, the religion of the Bible. Now in reference to this, the controversy which we have with both the Catholic discussions of Messrs. Hughes and Breckinridge, is peculiarly interesting.

The concessions of both parties in this controversy, fully corroborate the views which we have given to the public, from the press, for these last ten years. To these we shall attend in due time.

Meanwhile we cannot but express our regret to see the disadvantages under which Mr. Breckenridge labors in this controversy. I know not by what agency it came to pass, that he gave himself up, bound hand and foot, into the hands of his opponent. That the reader may perceive the advantage which Mr. Hughes has over Mr. Breckenridge, in this controversy, we shall here transcribe the rules of debate, with a remark or two:—

"RULES.

The undersigned agreeing to have an amicable discussion of the great points of religious controversy, between Protestants and Roman Catholics, do hereby bind themselves to the observance of the following rules:—

1. The parties shall write and publish, alternately, in the weekly religious papers called the Presbyterian, and a Roman Catholic paper, to be furnished by the first of January, it being understood that the communications shall be published after the following plan:—One party opening the first week, the other party replying the next week, and every piece to be republished in the immediately succeeding number of the Roman Catholic paper. The communications not to exceed four columns of the Presbyterian, nor to continue beyond six months, without consent of parties.

2. The parties agree that there is an infallible Rule of Faith established by Christ, to guide us in matters of religion, for the purpose of determining disputes in the Church of Christ.

3. They moreover agree, that after giving their views of the Rule of Faith, they shall proceed to discuss the question, "*Is the Protestant religion the religion of Christ?*"

4. The parties agree respectively, to adhere strictly to the subject of discussion, for the time being, and to admit no second question until the first shall have been exhausted. Each party shall be the judge when he is done with a subject, and shall be at liberty to occupy his time with a second topic, when he is done with the first, leaving to the other party the liberty of continuing to review the abandoned topic as long as he shall choose; subject, however, to be answered, if he introduce new matter.

5. Mr. Hughes to open the discussion, and Mr. Breckinridge to follow, according to the dictates of his own judgment.

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE,
JOHN HUGHES.

Philadelphia, December 14th, 1832."

Here we see Mr. Breckinridge, according to the rules of discussion, is prohibited from canvassing the pretensions of the Catholic church. The question is, "*Is the Protestant religion the religion of Christ?*" In attending to this question according to the previous rules, Mr. Breckinridge has no liberty to debate whether the Catholic religion is the religion of Christ. Mr. Hughes can very lawfully say, (according to the laws of discussion,) 'Sir, I agreed not to discuss the pretensions of the Catholic religion—I have only to show that you cannot prove the Protestant religion to be the religion of Christ. With this proposition before us, you might as rationally proceed to prove that the Mahomedan religion was not the religion of Christ, as that the Catholic is not. There is no debate upon the Catholic religion—our whole discussion is on the Protestant religion.' I say, Mr. Hughes might thus excuse himself from any notice of his opponent's attacks upon his religion; and Mr. Breckinridge must always transgress the laws of discussion when he attacks the pretensions of the Catholic religion. Why did he thus commit himself at the threshold? Was the Jesuit too wise for the Presbyterian, or did he unhesitatingly consent that if the Protestant religion should appear not to be the religion of Christ, that then, by necessity, the Catholic is the Christian religion? If Mr. Breckinridge so reasons, I do not.

Again, Mr. Breckinridge seems to have needlessly embarrassed himself by the phrase, "*Rule of Faith.*" Are the phrases *the faith*, and *the rule of faith*, of one and the same import? If not, the Bible cannot, with propriety, be called the faith and the infallible rule of faith. The controversy has been much embarrassed by the clumsiness of the terms, and by the awkwardness of the attitude in which Mr. Breckinridge chose to be placed. And, to consummate the whole, Mr. Hughes must commence the debate, and proceed to refute Mr. Breckinridge on the affirmations that "the Bible is the rule of faith," and "the Protestant religion is the religion of Christ," before a single argument is offered for the one or the other of these propositions.

Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, there is no doubt that the Protestant side of this controversy is so far triumphant. True, indeed, that Mr. Hughes has often brought Mr. Breckinridge to his knees; but not so often has he fallen upon the palms of his hands as his antagonist. They have had each sufficient documents to show that both their systems are doomed to destruction, because of the enormous sins which they have too successfully proved against each other. They have also fully proved that *neither* of them is the religion of the New Testament.

But we shall attempt to edify our readers more in detail by a more minute development of the remarkable concessions, and singular disclosures, with which this controversy abounds.

EDITOR.

Ability and Inability.

TWO Associations, (the Ketocton and the Columbia,) it is said, have denied a seat, in their deliberative councils, to Wm. F. Broaddus, because he had the temerity to affirm that "sinners ought to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, irrespective of the grace of God in their hearts." This, it is said, was the head and front of his offending. Mr. Broaddus, we presume to say, is a Fullerite, and these good brethren and Calvinists of the good old stamp.

Some of the brethren of the Dover Association have expressed great sympathy for friend Broaddus, because of his having been excluded from these Associations and desecrated of his ministerial functions by his good brethren. Tears are shed for brother Broaddus by those who last year excluded some half dozen of as unblemished men as can be found in the whole ministry of the Dover Association, for their daring to dissent from some of the opinions of Messrs. A. Broaddus' schools, (of oyster memory,) P. Montague, and John Kerr, of Richmond. "Those who lead into captivity, shall go into captivity." "All who take the sword, shall perish by the sword."

This proscription is about to awaken the slumbering virgins of Dover, and to cause much lamentation in the streets. Already has the pen of controversy been sharpened, and the Doctors of opinions are placing their inkhorns in battle array. The proposition is already displayed, and the affirmation has gone forth, that "sinners being unable to repent, it is contrary to common sense to be continually calling upon them to do so!"

The question which is now to run the gauntlet, shorn of all its trappings, is, in brief, '*Is the sinner unable to repent?*' 'Yes,' say the Ketocton and Columbia brethren; 'No,' say the sons of Dover. But then up come the metaphysicians, with a metaphysical case of instruments; and, after applying the knife to the term "*able*," they split it through the centre, and affirm that sinners are *morally* unable and *physically* able to repent. This physically able, and morally unable sinner, is, however, *unable* to repent; and when the account is set-

tled, it amounts, in American coin, to just the same thing as though there had been no controversy about it. The sinner is unable to repent till God bestows upon him the ability. This ability is "the grace" of Ketocton.

A writer who calls himself *Tertius*, in the Religious Herald of the 11th October, has undertaken to explain all these matters, and has given us an essay of some magnitude on the subject of ability to repent.

His doctrine is, that the sinner is able to repent, but is destitute of the disposition; and that "*the act of repentance* NEVER *does take place without the special influence of God's Spirit.*" He objects to the doctrine of physically able and morally unable, as absurd, and substitutes simple ability and simple indisposition in lieu of it. With him all men are able, but indisposed to repent. All, however, terminate in the same place, and leave the sinner in the same predicament.

A says, Sinners are both physically and morally unable to repent; yet God commands you to repent.

B says, Sinners, you are physically able, but morally unable to repent; and therefore you cannot repent till God remove, by his special grace, this moral inability.

C says, Sinners, you are fully able to repent; but you neither have, nor can have, disposition to repent, till God's Spirit give it you. Therefore, repent and believe the gospel.

Miserable comforters are you all! Your *glad tidings of great joy to all people* are a solemn mockery. They are *glad* tidings to none. The elect cannot rejoice when he hears them, because he does not know that he is one of the elect; and the non-elect finds no gospel in them, because he is taught that there is no gospel for him—God never having had one thought of mercy towards him!

D preaches not metaphysics, nor the philosophy of the human mind. He says, "The Lamb of God has taken away the sin of the world." He says, "God sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world," and now commands "ALL MEN, *every where*, to reform." He leaves it to the sinners to discover their own strength; and finally, tells them who refuse to obey the gospel, "Take heed lest that come upon you which is written in the Prophets—Behold, you despisers, and wonder, and perish!" EDITOR.

Newton, King & Queen, October 18, 1833.

Calvin on Baptism.

MY attention was this morning called to the 15th chapter and 4th book of Calvin's Institutes. From this section I may have given some extracts on baptism in my former numbers; but I think the following remarks of this great reformer have not been presented in this work. To those who think that we are extravagantly fanatical, enthusiastic, or egregiously astray on this subject, we would recommend the perusal of the whole of this 15th chapter of book 4; not, indeed, as alto-

gether orthodox in our view, but as containing so much clear and unequivocal testimony in favor of the true intent and meaning of Peter's opening speech in Jerusalem some 1800 years ago. I say *testimony*, for John Calvin's *opinions* are of the force of semi-apostolic testimony with many very worthy citizens who may happen to see the following excerpts.

Disliking, as much as I do, partial extracts, I have resolved to give whole and entire the first five paragraphs of the 15th chapter:—

"Baptism is a sign of initiation, by which we are admitted into the society of the church, in order that being incorporated into Christ, we may be numbered among the children of God. Now it has been given to us by God for these ends, which I have shown to be common to all sacraments:—First, to promote our faith towards him; secondly, to testify our confession before men. We shall treat of both these ends of its institution in order. To begin with the first: from baptism our faith derives three advantages which require to be distinctly considered. The first is, that it is proposed to us by the Lord as a symbol and token of purification; or, to express my meaning more fully, it resembles *a legal instrument, properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us:* FOR HE COMMANDS ALL WHO BELIEVE TO BE BAPTIZED FOR THE REMISSION OF THEIR SINS.* Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign, as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the principal thing in baptism—which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*"

"2. In this sense we are to understand what is said by Paul, that "Christ sanctifieth and cleanseth the church with the washing of the water by the word;" and in another place, that "according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and by Peter, that "baptism doth save us." For it was not the intention of Paul to signify that our ablution and salvation are completed by the water, or that water contains within itself the virtue to purify, regenerate, and renew; nor did Peter mean that it was the cause of salvation, but only that *the knowledge and assurance of it are received in this sacrament*, which is sufficiently evident from the words which they have used: for Paul connects together "the word of life" and "the baptism of water," as if he had said that our ablution and sanctification are announced to us by the gospel, and by baptism this message is confirmed. And Peter, after having said that baptism doth save us, immediately adds, that "it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God," which proceeds from faith. But on the contrary, baptism promises us no other purification than by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, which

* We have *italicised* and CAPITALIZED certain words and sentences in these extracts. This is the only change from the copy before me.

is emblematically represented by water, on account of its resemblance to washing and cleansing. Who, then can contend that we are cleansed by that water which clearly testifies the blood of Christ to be our true and only ablution? So that to refute the error of those who refer all to the virtue of water, no better argument could be found than in the signification of baptism itself, which abstracts us, as well from that visible element which is placed before our eyes, as from all other means of salvation, that it may fix our minds on Christ alone

"3. Nor must it be supposed that baptism is administered only for the time past, so that for sins into which we fall after baptism, it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in I know not what other sacraments, as the virtue of baptism were become obsolete. In consequence of this error, it happened in former ages, that some persons would not be baptized except at the close of their life, and almost in the moment of their death, that so they might obtain pardon for their whole life—a preposterous caution, which is often censured in the writings of the ancient Bishops. But we ought to conclude at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life.* Whenever we have fallen into sin, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins. For though when it has been once administered, it appears to be past: yet it is not abolished by subsequent sins. For the purity of Christ is offered to us in it, and that always retains its virtue, is never overcome by any blemishes; but purifies and obliterates all our defilements. Now from this doctrine we ought not to take a license for the commission of future sins: for it is very far from inculcating such presumption. It is only delivered to those who, when they have sinned, groan under the fatigue and oppression of of their transgressions, in order to afford them some relief and consolation, and to preserve them from sinking into confusion and despair. Thus Paul says that Christ was set forth to be a propitiation for the remission of sins that are past. He does not deny that we have a constant and perpetual remission of sins in Christ; but signifies that this has been given by the Father only to miserable sinners, who sigh for the Physician to heal the wounds of a guilty conscience. To such the mercy of God is offered; while those, who, from a remission of punishment, seek to derive an occasion and license from sinning, do nothing but draw down upon themselves the wrath and vengeance of God.

"4. I know the common opinion is, that remission of sins, *which at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone*, is afterwards obtained by repentance and the benefit of the keys. But the advocates of this opinion have fallen into an error, for want of considering that the power of the keys of which they speak, is so dependent on baptism that it cannot by any means be separated from it. It is true that the

*This is to be understood with much limitation. It is only as it introduces us into a new state, in which sin cannot have dominion over us. The old reformer is too strong for us here, unless we limit his language very much.—*Ed.*

sinner receives remission by the ministry of the church, but not without the preaching of the gospel. Now what is the nature of that preaching? That we are cleansed from our sins by the blood of Christ. What sign or testimony of that ablution is there, except baptism? We see, then, how this absolution is referred to baptism. This error has produced the imaginary sacrament of penance, on which I have touched a little already, and shall finish what remains in its proper place. Now it is no wonder, if men whose grovelling minds were inordinately attached to external things, have betrayed that corrupt propensity by a discontent with the pure institution of God, and an introduction of new expedients invented by themselves, as if baptism were not a sacrament of repentance: but if repentance be enjoined upon us as long as we live, the virtue of baptism ought to be extended to the same period. Wherefore, it is evident the faithful, whenever in any part of their lives they are distressed with a consciousness of their sins, may justly have recourse to the remembrance of baptism in order to confirm themselves in the confidence of their interest in that one perpetual oblation which is enjoyed in the blood of Christ.

"5. Baptism is also attended with another advantage: it shows us our mortification in Christ, and our new life in him. For, as the Apostle says, "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death; therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that we should walk in newness of life." In this passage he does not merely exhort us to an imitation of Christ, as if he had said, that we are admonished by baptism that, after the example of his death, we should die to sin; and that, after the example of his resurrection, we should rise to righteousness: but he goes considerably farther, and teaches us that by baptism Christ has made us partakers of his death, in order that we may be engrafted into it. And as the scion derives substance and nourishment from the root on which it is engrafted, so they who receive baptism with the faith with which they ought to receive it, truly experience the efficacy of Christ's death in the mortification of the flesh, and also the energy of his resurrection in the vivification of the Spirit. He uses the same argument in another place—that we are circumcised, putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, after we have been buried with Christ in baptism; and in this sense, in the passage already quoted, he calls it the washing of regeneration and renewing. Thus we are promised, first, the gratuitous remission of sins and imputation of righteousness; and, secondly, the grace of the Holy Spirit to reform us to newness of life."

Now let me ask the candid reader of this essay from the pen of John Calvin himself, how much more orthodox than ourselves was this celebrated reformer? We have heard him explain himself fully on these great items, and may we not say that the chief difference between him and us, is, that *we practise what we teach.* "There is," says the reformer Calvin, "one other advantage received from baptism—this is the certain testimony it affords us that we are not only

engrafted into the life and death of Christ, but are so united as to be partakers of all his benefits"—"All the gifts of God which are presented in baptism, are found in Christ alone."

We leave it to the good sense of the reader, whether John Calvin ought not to be called *a Campbellite* as well as the Apostle Peter.

EDITOR.

Fredericksburg, Va. October 14, 1833.

Believer's Baptism and Infant Sprinkling, *CONTRASTED.*

Believer's Baptism.	*Infant Sprinkling.*
Believer's baptism is commanded.—Matth.	Infant sprinkling has not a single command.
Believer's baptism has examples.	Infant sprinkling has no example.
Believer's baptism is from heaven. Matth. xxi.	Infant sprinkling is from men.
Believer's baptism is the counsel of God.	Infant sprinkling has the counsel of men.
Believer's baptism has been sealed from heaven.	Infant sprinkling never was sealed of God.
In believer's baptism the person submits in acts of obedience to the gospel.	In infant sprinkling the infant puts forth no acts of obedience to the gospel, but to men.
Believers are buried with Christ by baptism.—Rom. vi. 4.	Infants are not buried, but only sprinkled.
All believers that are baptized are thereby brought into Christ.—Gal. iii. 27.	Infants are not thus brought into Christ.
All believers baptized receive the remission of sins.—Acts ii. 37, 38.	Infants do not receive remission of sins. They have no sins to be remitted.
God has promised that all who believe and are baptized shall be saved.—Mark xvi. 16.	God has not promised that all sprinkled infants shall be saved.
Believers rejoice when they are baptized.—Acts viii. 37. & xvi. 34.	Infants cannot rejoice.
All the world may undeniably affirm that believers were baptized by the Apostles.—Acts viii. 12.	But none can affirm that any infant was sprinkled by the Apostles.
Those who practise infant sprinkling are compelled to confess believer's baptism.	But all baptized believers do not acknowledge, but deny infant sprinkling.
All baptized believers are living stones, fit for God's building.—1 Pet. 2. 5.	But all sprinkled infants are not living stones, fit for God's building.
Baptized believers build on Christ by their own faith.	Sprinkled infants are builded on the faith of others.
They that receive Christ upon their own faith, shall never perish.—John x. 28.	But such as are sprinkled upon another's faith, have no such assurance.
Baptized believers know Christ to be precious.—2 Pet. ii. 7.	Sprinkled infants have no such knowledge.
Baptized believers love Christ and keep his commandments.—John xiv. 15.	Sprinkled infants do not love Christ nor keep his commandments, for they are incapable.

Believer's Baptism.	*Infant Sprinkling.*
Baptized believers may repel Satan as Christ did, saying, "IT IS WRITTEN, *They believed and were baptized.*"	But infant sprinklers cannot say, 'It is written, *Infants were baptized;*' for it is not written.

The foregoing contrast is enough, I would think, to convince every mind, which is not so shackled and trammelled by prejudice, prepossession, and parental education, as to be rendered invulnerable to the truth, though strongly enforced by the infallible word of God, reason, and every thing that merits the name of evidence. But the time is evidently near at hand, when, I awfully fear, they will lament their folly. I tremble when I consider the near approach of the time when every thing of human policy, invented in place of the pure religion of Jesus Christ, must be lost in one universal wreck of irreparable ruin. My apprehensions proportionably increase as I view, (as to me appears evident,) that by far the greater part of the world is in an unprepared state; nay, the greater part of professors of Christianity, are not prepared to say, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly;" nor the societies, to which they belong, ready to respond, "Amen; come, Lord Jesus."

S. K. MILTON.

BETHANY, *Brooke County, Va.*

To B. W. Stone.

Respected Brother,

TO the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings of Christ, you farther object their inadequateness to the punishments, both temporal and eternal, due to us for sin. You ask, "Have these punishments been really inflicted on Christ in our stead?" &c. &c. And, therefore, you suppose "that I must have written without due consideration of the sentiment for which I plead." Not so, dear brother; I have most seriously considered this tremendously important subject. The heinous malignity—the infinite demerit and evil of sin. I have considered it as manifested both in men and devils, according to the scripture representations of their sad iniquities; and, with these tremendous documents before me, have also endeavored to calculate its intrinsic evil, its real demerit, the enormous amount of which has appeared to me *truly infinite.* I have found it to be the ungrateful rebellion of highly dignified and exalted creatures, existing in glorious and blissful circumstances,—against their infinitely glorious and beneficent Creator,—whose goodness had laid them under infinite obligations to love and obey him.—Also, that in rejecting him, they had rejected all excellency, perfection, and glory; consequently, were guilty of an infinite evil. I mean an evil, in its nature and extent, in exact proportion to the excellency of the *character* against *which* it it was committed, and the obligations of *those* by *whom* it was committed. But the dignity of the *party rejected* being infinite, and the obligations of the *party rejecting* being also infinite—add these together, and you have the sum total; but we have no terms adequate to express the amount. Thus you will perceive that I form no light estimate of sin.

But, considering sin in its heinous nature and dreadful consequences, you ask, "Did Christ suffer the punishment due to us?" You

explain yourself to mean, 'Did he suffer it in its intensity and eternity—in all the varieties of its tortures, temporal and eternal, both in soul and body?' I answer, *No;* for had he done so, he had neither saved himself, nor any one else; for this plain reason—the debt had never been paid, but would have been still in paying; and, if so, justice must, and would have retained the debtors, till they, or their surety, had paid the very last mite. But, my dear friend, cannot adequate payment be made, unless it be made in kind, in quantity, or in quality? Will not five pieces of gold, each not larger than a dollar, pay a debt of fifty dollars? Will not a diamond, not exceeding an ounce weight, be accepted as an equivalent for fifty ounces of gold, or for five hundred ounces of silver? Will not one day's labor of a Doctor, a Lawyer, a Judge, &c. be accepted as an equivalent for a month's hard labor of a common farmer or mechanic? And are not all these commutations in perfect consistency with the universally acknowledged principles of reason and justice? And is there not a greater difference between the intrinsic worth, the personal dignity of the Son of God, and sinful creatures, than between any created objects we can imagine? Is he not a person of infinite worth? Does he not comprehend in himself all perfection, created and uncreated, divine and human? For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell; and in him dwells all the fulness of the divinity substantially. Col. ii. 9. And, if so, may not the sum total of his humiliations, sufferings, death, and subsequent imprisonment in the regions of the dead, be justly considered as an equivalent for all the penal consequences of sin, to have been justly inflicted forever upon the guilty creatures, that shall be saved through him?—"redeemed to God by his blood, out of every tribe, and language, and people, and nation"?

But to the vicarious sufferings of Christ you again object—"If he, as vicar, has paid the punishment due to us, why do we all still suffer sickness, pain, and death?" I answer—The provisions of the remedial institution do not directly and properly interfere with the penalties of the natural, but only with their duration; for, in case of failure, the natural institution provided death; that is, the separation of the whole person from the enjoyment of God; for death, simply considered, can do no more than this. Farther penalties may be added on farther considerations; or, indeed, might have been to the first offence, if the Lord had pleased. But as it is, and was predetermined, the primitive threatening has taken its full effect; it has brought death spiritual and corporeal upon the whole human family;—first, upon the original transgressors; for, according to the threatening, they died spiritually the self-same day in which they transgressed, as was manifest by their immediate conduct; and afterward they died corporeally in due time. The remedial dispensation, then, interferes not with the execution of the primitive sentence, but only with the duration of it, which, in the mean time, makes no part of the sentence; for had God said, 'In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die for ever,' there had been no

emedial dispensation—the truth of God had rendered it forever impossible; but as the matter now stands, there is nothing, if the Lord please, in the way of our redemption and restoration to the enjoyment of the divine image, favor, and fellowship, which we justly forfeited and lost by our sins.

But some may object, and say, 'According to this view of the matter, might not God, in perfect consistence with truth and justice, have restored all mankind without a Redeemer, after having first executed the original sentence upon them?' We answer, *No*: that for the following reasons:—First, because it did not seem good to him so to do. Second, because, that in so doing, he would have verified, at least, the full import of the serpent's temptation; namely, that by transgressing they would greatly better their condition; which would have been true, had it proved the happy occasion of putting them into the possession of a blissful immortality. Third, because justice itself would say, that those who had rendered themselves unworthy of life, should not be restored to the enjoyment of what they had justly forfeited. Fourth, because they were guilty of an infinite evil, which nothing could justly counterbalance but a *per contra* of infinite value—a consideration that would justify the divine justice, truth, and holiness; that is, the governmental or regal character of God, in releasing guilty creatures from a justly deserved forfeiture—a just condemnation. But again, to obviate Isaiah's testimony to the vicarious nature of Christ's sufferings, you quote Matth. viii. 16, 17. as affording a just exposition of the Prophet's meaning, [chap. liii. 4.) which, you say, you prefer to mine, and to all others ever made by man. But why did you not also quote Peter's exposition, or rather application, of the same passage—"Who, his own self, bore our sins in his *own body* on the tree; that we, being dead to [or by] sins, should live to righteousness; by whose stripes you were healed. For you were as sheep going astray; but are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." 1 Pet. We see that Peter carries out the application something farther than Matthew does; for he applies not to the miraculous bearing away, or healing of our bodily sicknesses and infirmities; but to the bearing away of our sins themselves, the just procuring causes of those evils; and this, not by miraculous operations upon the persons of the afflicted, but by the most intense sufferings, in his own proper person, upon the tree. Yet you blame my exposition; namely, "That the Lord laid on him *the punishment due* to the iniquities of us all." For which, you say, I have no scripture authority, notwithstanding the above quotation, and many others, equally explicit, to the same purpose. But we shall give place to your alternative. You say, "He laid on him the work of taking away our iniquities, with all their train of sickness, pain, and death." Dear brother, where is your scriptural authority for all this? Has he, indeed, taken away all the train of sickness, pain, and death, brought upon us by our iniquities? Why, then, are we still subject to, and do actually suffer, all these things? And, pray, what is the difference between

laying on him the work of taking away our iniquities, and laying on him the punishment due to them? Was it not by his sufferings he took them away? Was he not once offered to bear away the sins of many? Has he not been once manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself? Heb. ix. 26, 28. Did he not himself bear away our sins in *his own body*, on the tree; that *we*, being *freed* from sins, might live to righteousness; by whose stripes we are healed? 1 Pet. ii. 24. These things being so, what is the difference between us on this point? For if, according to your statement, "the Lord laid on him the work of taking away our iniquities," which necessarily subjected him to death, even the death of the cross, on which "he bore away our sins in his own body; by whose stripes we are healed;" without the shedding of whose blood there is *no remission:*—what is the difference between this, and his bearing the *punishment due* to our iniquities? Did he suffer unduly? Was there no just reason? Did the Father put into his hand a cup of mingled sorrows—of sorrows the most exquisite; and while expiring under them, withhold his comforting presence? And could any thing justify such treatment but *sin? No:* "he suffered for sins—the just for the unjust;—for the sins of the world—a ransom for many." May we not, then, justly call it punishment? Especially seeing it was inflicted on account of our iniquities; and did really take them away; for the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all; that is, the punishment due to our iniquity; and, "he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"—"he has redeemed us to God by his blood"—"we are bought with a price"—"not with corruptible things, as silver and gold—but, with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot"—even "the Lamb of God who took away the sin of the world." Wherefore we cannot grant your assumption; viz. that this exposition of yours accords with Matthew's view, and with the whole current of scripture.

You next proceed to object to my answer to N. W's demand; viz. Where shall we find a promise that those shall be saved, who rely on a vicarious punishment for the remission of their sins? In answer to this, I quoted Rom. iii. 25, 26. and v. 9. and Eph. i. 7. In these quotations justification or forgiveness of sins, by the blood of Christ, through faith in it as our redemption, is expressly declared. Now, your objection, upon the whole, amounts to this: You say, "For my life, I cannot see any vicarious punishment here; nor any promise of remission of sins to those who rely on such punishment;—nor pardon, or justification by such punishment, even hinted." You grant, however, that "we all believe that through the blood of Jesus we obtain redemptin, or remission of sins;"—but *how*, is the question. This question you do not pretend to answer, except by maintaining N. W's position, which you do towards the bottom of the ensuing page, (228.) But I answer from the above quotation, Rom. iii. 25—"*By faith in it*," because it was shed for us. *This*, however, you cannot admit, because it implies *substitution*, and, of course, *vicarious sufferings*. But, to these terms you object, "that they are not scriptural." To

speak of Bible subjects in Bible terms, is, I grant, a good and safe rule; and one which I both teach and practise as far as possible. But when we have to do with persons who either do not understand those terms in certain connexions; or attempt to impose meanings upon them subversive of their true contextural import, we are obliged to select and use such terms as will explain, maintain, and exhibit their true meaning. Now this is exactly the case in the subject before us. N. W., and others, would explain away the scriptural import of the divinely instituted connexion between Christ and the sinner, in the article of his sufferings and death, from his entrance into the garden of Gethsemane, till he expired upon the cross, and was entombed in the sepulchre; make the whole affair a mere test of sincerity—an example of persevering steadfastness—of self-denying obedience in suffering for the truth, as did also Stephen, and other faithful martyrs. Whereas the scriptures present us with a quite different view of this matter. They not only exhibit Christ as a devoted lover of God and truth, and as a devoted philanthropist—willing to do and suffer every thing for the glory of God and the good of mankind—confirming his testimony with his blood, that we might believe it; and thus also leaving us an example, that we might follow his steps:—But moreover, and more especially, that he *so* suffered and died for *us*—the *just* for the *unjust*, that being *justified* by his *blood*, *we* shall be saved from wrath through *him*—*so* to redeem us to God by *his blood*, that we have *redemption* through *it*, even the *forgiveness of sins*;—whom God has set forth to be our *propitiatory* through faith in *his blood* for the *remission of past sins*.—upon whom alone, as you grant, "God laid the work of taking away our iniquities;" which he accordingly did "by the sacrifice of himself;" for he so bore away our sins in his *own body* on the tree; that *we* being *freed* from *sins*, might live to *righteousness*; —by *whose stripes we are healed*. Surely *he* has borne *our griefs*, *and carried our sorrows*;—he was wounded for *our* transgressions—*bruised* for *our* iniquities—the chastisement of our peace was upon *him*.—All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.—For the transgression of my people was he stricken.—Yes, though perfectly innocent, "it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he put him to grief; he made his soul an offering for sin." Now, if all this does not, to all intents and purposes, declare a substitution, exhibit a substitute, and present us with vicarious sufferings, we know not what language *means*; or *what* language could have done it to better purpose. Nevertheless, when, after all that has been said, the obvious sense of the sacred style seems to be misunderstood, we know of no terms in our language less exceptionable, or better adapted to express the meaning of the divine oracles upon this all-important subject, than those we have chosen.—For if *substitute* signifies one put in the stead or room of another, to do or suffer in his place; and if substitution is expressive of so placing a person; and if *vicarious* signifies his occupancy; —then, most surely, according to the above scriptures, may Jesus

Christ be justly called a *substitute;* his location, a *substitution;* and his sufferings to death, *vicarious.* Most assuredly, also, do the old philosophical axioms verify this conclusion—"Things that are equal to one and the same thing, are equal to one another;" and, "That to which all the attributes of a thing agree, is the thing itself." But, to the sufferings and death of which of the noble and exemplary army of the martyrs, have the scriptures any where ascribed one of the effects or predicates above affirmed of the sufferings and death of the Prince of Martyrs?—No, not *one—any* where—of *any one* of them.

I conclude this article by observing that the very term *sin-offering*, or sacrifice for sin, if scripturally considered, forever settles the point at issue. We know that the wages of sin, of *every sin*, is death; consequently, every time a person sins, he forfeits his life: seeing, however, that he can die but once; and that it is the good pleasure of God to spare his life, and, at the same time, both to chastise and teach him; he therefore calls for a sin-offering—a young bullock without blemish, which the culprit is to bring to the door of the congregation before the Lord:—lay his hand on its head, and kill it before the Lord; the blood and fat, &c. of which being disposed of according to the law, the officiating priest is then to carry forth the whole residue of the bullock without the camp, into a clean place, and burn it on the wood with fire. Thus terminates this awfully solemn and significant institution, in the complete destruction of the sin-offering, the remains of which were burnt without the camp; in allusion to which, Christ, the true antitype, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Heb. xiii. 12. In this striking contrast of the type and antitype, which the Apostle gives us, we clearly understand the one by the other. Now does not this sacrificial institution most expressively declare the deadly and destructive demerit of sin? And, at the same time, the divine mercy in providing a substitute—an innocent victim to undergo the deadly destruction, deserved by the actual transgressor? And as to the typical and figurative import of those sacrifices, does not the Apostle fully admonish us in the previous part of the epistle? [see the 9th and 10th chapters;] in the latter of which he winds up the whole matter by observing, that "every priest stands daily ministering and offering often the same sacrifices, which never can take away sins; but Christ having offered only one sacrifice for sins, through his whole life, sat down at the right hand of God; thenceforth waiting till his enemies be made his footstool. Wherefore, by one offering he has perfected forever the sanctified.—Hence in the light of these premises, we evidently see that a sin-offering, or a sacrifice for sin, is the substitution of the innocent for the guilty—the devoted victim suffering the deserved fate of the guilty transgressor, by virtue of which he stands exempted, having taken the benefit of the act passed in his favor, by complying with which he is acquitted.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

Signs of the Times.

[CONTINUED.]

PROPHECY, relative to Christ's second coming, will now be briefly considered.

I have shown the necessity of his coming. If necessary—then it is just as certain as necessary. No impartial observer, of the increasing discord on earth, (clerical as well as political,) of the increase of crime, can expect it to subside of itself. Nothing can produce one universal interest—"one faith, one Lord, one baptism," but one universal, visible, incontrovertible, miraculous display of omnipotent glory and power—such as will at once prostrate thrones and dominions, principalities and powers—just such a display as is foretold. What a shock is the event to produce! How unprepared will the present generation be for the reception of the King! Alas! how few of our sceptical priests will have on the wedding garment! How few of their misguided flocks will be ready to partake of the marriage supper. The sad effects of a negative will then appear—the fatal consequence of misapplying the prophecies or disbelieving the simple meaning of God's word. What a responsibility is hanging over the pulpit!

In my way, I have drawn arguments for the dissolution of the present dispensation, from the incurable divisions and animosities of the Christian world—from the utter impossibility, under the present system, the present missionary exertions, with any given amount of filthy lucre, to convert or evangelize the heathen world —from the increase of crime—from the fact, that dispensations, after becoming corrupt, are never renovated—from the notorious fact, that they have never lasted longer than about two thousand years—that they have closed, therefore may close again. That a like cause will produce a like effect—that God's past dealings with corrupt dispensations is a fair and safe criterion by which we may judge of the future. That prophecy will not, without rude absurdities, concentrate on the dissolution of nature. That dispensations are alluded to under the figures *world, heaven*, &c. That the times of the Gentiles is to be fulfilled, and that the present dispensation committed to the Gentiles, is unequivocally the antitype of the Jewish typical gospel; it therefore does, must, and will agree with the type in every point, jot, and tittle. That the leading mistakes and faults of the one are and will be the faults, mistakes, and fate of the other. That the most signal judgments attended the close of the former; and, according to prophecy, will attend the close of the present. That the world has never suffered general and sore judgments at a time of general piety. That judgments are, and have been, the last resort of Heaven. That universal judgments are an indubitable proof of universal corruption.* That

*Our lying clergy are telling us much about evangelizing the world, and curing it of intemperance, &c. while God is sweeping it with "the besom of destruction." That crime is not on the increase—that religion is gaining ground; while pestilence is desolating the world. Who has heard—has read of

Christianity, in the common acceptation, is not the religion of Christ at all; but a spurious religion, administering gall, wormwood, creeds, fire and faggot, in the general, instead of the cordials of life. That the temple of God, or his simple government, is usurped by the son of perdition. That clerical tyranny and filthy lucre have ruined God's heritage. That the sealing time is to close. And lastly, have shown that the two witnesses spoken of in Revelation, are to finish "their testimony."

Now, reader, there are two witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, veiled in mourning, bearing witness in God's moral government. These all-efficient agents in man's salvation are to finish "their testimony," be they what they may. Merciful God! what is to ensue? "The beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them." Woe unto the world when the last struggle is made by Antichrist against the liberties of man! I would sink into despondency while viewing the gathering storm, were it not that the same inspiration which foretells *famine, pestilence,* and *war,* (a time of trouble such as never was,") foretells also, and bids a hope spring up in the midst of ghastly ruin, anguish, and distress of nations; when men's hearts are "failing them for fear, and looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken; and then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh."

Now, reader, if I have in any degree proved the dissolution of the present administration, I have just that far proved Christ's second coming. If I have not proved a dissolution of the present administration, I have proved or shown the absurdity of applying the prophecies to the dissolution of nature. The laws of nature have remained unchangeable near six thousand years; and on no given principles or laws in nature, can its dissolution take place. If nature is to be dissolved, the unchangeable laws of nature must be violated. The dissolution of nature is unscriptural and unphilosophical; therefore, we must search in God's moral heavens for objects on which prophecy will concentrate.

I repeat it again, that the coming of the Son of Man must follow, of necessity, if the present administration is to close, and a new one granted the human family. No authority short of that which estab-

the like?—A just God pouring the vials of his wrath amidst abounding piety! Pestilence, without a parallel in history, is slaying its millions; and our lying priests saying, 'It is not for an increase of crime!' In the name of wonder, what is it for? A just God scourging the pious feeble creatures he has made, while they are "lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting"!

If there be an increase of crime, on whom will the fault fall? Look at the people, and you have a fair specimen of the priests. The old proverb will hold good while time lasts—"Like people, like priest." Who ever saw a holy, humble, spiritual priest, without a pious flock? The crime of the world will be charged to the pulpit—the clergy. They are waiting and looking for outpouring of the Spirit, and God pouring out vengeance.

lished the laws in the present, can dissolve them. No authority short of the King of kings, can establish on principles of everlasting duration, the law or government of his universal empire.

THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL.

I will here make a few remarks on the fulfilment of prophecy.

Prophecies have commonly been delivered in metaphors; but always *literally* fulfilled. Metaphors never represent metaphors; but always represent facts. We must look for the *literal* fulfilment of predictions which are in the future, (not a spiritual fulfilment,) if we may judge of the future by the past. Prophecy can have no definite meaning without an identical, literal object or accomplishment. An indefinite meaning to prophecy, is no meaning at all. If spiritual meaning may be attached to prophecy, we may spiritualize *ad infinitum*, without ever arriving at certainty: certainty is a matter of no small consideration. In facts alone is certainty to be found.

It may not be improper to examine a few predictions relative to Christ's first advent. If they were literally fulfilled, so will those be relative to his second. "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel"—"A man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; wounded for our transgressions; bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth. He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. He made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." It would be useless to quote the many passages relative to Christ's first advent, which have had a plain literal fulfilment.

Who can say a prophecy has been fulfilled, without showing facts—aye, unequivocal facts? Facts need no proof; they can be identified. But spiritual meanings to prophecy, like the *ignis fatuus*, can never be identified—can never be overtaken. As soon as it is proved that the predictions relative to Christ's second coming are to have nothing but a spiritual meaning, I will then prove that they have no meaning at all; or that they will never be accomplished on earth.

If Christ is to come imperceptibly, he will reign imperceptibly; which will be equal to not coming or reigning at all. If so, he is imperceptibly to conquer his enemies, or rule the nations, or receive dominion and glory. All nations are imperceptibly to be given into his hands, and he is to hold a sceptre of this kind over kingdoms, nations, and languages. And Antichrist is to fall in this very way; and "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth," is imperceptibly to drink the vials of the wrath of Almighty God!

We now purpose showing where Christ's kingdom is to be—where all prophecy relative to his reign is to be fulfilled; then show that his second coming and universal reign is to be the same—is to be a second

display of glory rising above the present, as much as it is superior to the Jewish economy.

That every prediction relative to Christ's kingdom is to have an accomplishment on earth, we will refer to Paul, Cor. xv. 24. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Death, resurrection, and immortality are the leading features of this 15th chapter; and from the 23d to the 28th verses there seems to be a plain digression from the subject, and a paragraph introduced relative to Christ's coming, subduing his enemies, reigning, abolishing death: and when the great work of salvation is complete and the human drama wound up, the King of kings is to present to his Father, by way of submission, the trophies of his victories, the blood-washed millions who have been redeemed to God "out of all nations, and kindred, and people, and tongues"—"a great multitude."

It is plainly implied in the passage that there is to be an *end;* that previous to this *end* Christ is to reign--not after. Christ's reign is truly and fairly previous to a state of immortality. "That flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." That we cannot properly be in the kingdom of God while in a state of probation; but in the kingdom of Christ. Christ's reign is but a preparatory state for the kingdom of God. According to Paul, Christ is to come, is to reign, is to subdue his enemies, is to abolish death. This is to be transacted on earth. There are no enemies in heaven.

Now, how is death to be destroyed? It cannot be done, but by ushering every human being in existence into a state of immortality. "Then cometh the end," when the work of salvation is closed, "when this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality." Then those who may be counted "worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection," will be introduced into a third heaven.

Here I will answer a *query* by the Editor, in the June number, page 274:—"If the third heaven be a third dispensation, why may not the first resurrection be a great revival?"

Many revivals have taken place since the introduction of Christianity. if the passage before us has a reference to a revival. "Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first resurrection." Then all the revivals which have taken place are not worthy of notice, compared to it. And we may, with propriety, render the passage thus: 'Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first *revival!*' How many revivals are promised? When is this revival to take place? Before or after the Millennium? If before, on whom are the vials of the wrath of Almighty God to be poured? Will God pour out his vials of wrath in the midst of a *great revival?* There is no room for such a revival under the present dispensation, or there is none for the judgments which are foretold. If the *great revival* takes place after the introduction of Christ's reign, when all are to know him from the

least to the greatest, on whom is this passage to be consummated? "But the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished." If the first resurrection, here spoken of, means a revival, it must mean God's people: then to whom will the other figure apply—*"rest of the dead"?* This must, of necessity, apply to the people of the world; who, of course, are, and must be, from the face of the passage, excluded from participating in the *great revival*—no, not a solitary one of them, for the space of one thousand years, is to *live!* Now on whom is this revival to exist? Without accessions to the church, a revival would not be worth getting up. This revival would supersede a new dispensation. A new dispensation cannot be a revival.

There is, perhaps, no word in our language more used and less understood, than the word *heaven.* With our clergy, and their implicit followers, this word has but one uniform meaning; when the fact is, in the Scripture, it has three fair and distinct applications. Also, there are three different applications of the term *world.* The sense will always determine.

1st. The world in the common acceptation—the material earth.

2d. It is applied to dispensations—"On whom the ends of the world are come."

3d. A state of immortality—"But they who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection."

The three heavens. 1st. The field of nature is called *heaven*—"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work." In the field of nature, or God's material heavens, there are found, sun, moon, stars, earth, air, fire, water, &c.

2d. God's moral government on earth is called *heaven*, kingdom of *heaven*, &c. and sun, moon, stars, air, water, fire, &c. are called for in this kingdom of grace, or God's moral heaven, that there may be a harmony and correspondence in all the works of the all-wise Sovereign of the Universe. Metaphors are drawn from the kingdom of nature, representing things in the kingdom of grace.

A state of immortality is called heaven.

I have shown in the foregoing part of this work, that God's moral administration on earth is called *heaven;* and that a state of immortality in happiness is called *heaven*, will be admitted by all.

We come into existence according to constituted laws, in the kingdom of nature. We are made citizens in God's moral heavens, according to the constituted laws in this kingdom. By living in obedience to the laws in this kingdom, we become heirs, according to promise, of the kingdom of immortality. We are born into the kingdom of nature. We are born into the kingdom of grace by the new birth. We are born into the kingdom of immortality by a resurrection from the dead.

In reading God's word we should have respect to these heavens. Passages which will not apply to the natural heavens, should be applied to the moral. And remember it is an improper application of holy writ, that involves a violation of the laws of nature. Different states of existence, not entirely of locality, may constitute all of these *heavens.*

But to return to our subject of Christ's reign. We cannot at this time call to mind one solitary text that speaks of Christ reigning in a state of immortality; but his great mission is to be accomplished on earth in "bringing many sons to glory;" and no passage that speaks of Christ reigning jointly with the Father on earth; but it is to be the "throne of his glory:" which in his times shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. This must relate to this earth, for there is another Potentate in the heavens of immortality. And that of making the enemies of Christ his footstool, and bringing "all things in subjection under his feet," must relate to this world, for there can be nothing in the realms above that needs subjugation. And no doubt but the Patriarchs and Apostles are to reign with Christ jointly in his kingdom; for the twenty-four elders are represented as singing a new song, saying of Christ, "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." Reader, bear this in mind. These very four and twenty elders are to "reign on the earth"! Now is there any need of priests in the invisible world? And who is so zeal-smitten as to think the present race or order of priests may reign on earth? Woe unto the world the day of their coronation! See what they have done and are doing. They are, and have been, the greatest enemies of toleration and liberty of conscience on earth. Yet the time is coming when the saints are to possess the kingdom. This cannot be the present race of saints, or the present administration of God's moral government on earth; for they have well nigh ruined it, and would ruin any government on earth, had they but one little consideration granted them—viz. *power.*

That they cannot be trusted with the reins of government, is but too plain to every impartial observer. They may not possess the kingdom; it was not intended for the present dispensation to rule; for Christ and the Apostles have uniformly taught submission to the powers that be. Obedience to kings, rulers, &c. is a plain command. Most of the precepts under the present dispensation entirely preclude the idea of reigning. Persecution is a part of the legacy bequeathed to all those who live godly in Christ Jesus. The holy city is to be trodden under foot forty and two months. This relates to the church; for the prediction was made long after the destruction of Jerusalem. This is evidently a dispensation of Christ's humility and suffering; but the next will be, Christ exalted, ruling, reigning gloriously, the King of kings.

Prophecy relative to Christ's *coming* is relative to his *reign;* and the New Testament abounds with predictions of this kind, which must correspond in meaning with the prophecy in the Old. [See Dan. vii. 13.] This is the beginning prediction relative to Christ coming in the clouds of heaven; and it is of much importance to us that we fairly ascertain the old Prophet's meaning, for it will afford a clue by which every prophecy where the "clouds of heaven" are

mentioned may be understood. If we mistake at the outstart, we may eventually mistake beyond remedy. I have already made some remarks upon this 7th of Daniel. It affords much matter of the greatest importance. Its leading features are—1st. The four empires which were to rise in succession. 2d. A little horn which was to rise out of the fourth. 3d. The sitting of a judgment, casting down of thrones, &c. and a signal destruction of the little horn, or Antichrist. We have the character of Antichrist fairly drawn, and the length of his reign—"And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High." "And they shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of time." This is the length of time that Antichrist is to reign, according to John's testimony.

Perhaps all admit that there are about twelve hundred and sixty years implied in the above—"a time, and times, and the dividing of time." Now to fix on a certain time for the commencement of these twelve hundred and sixty years, is a matter of much importance; and there is but one passage in sacred writ that affords a data from which we may make a safe calculation. In the 8th chapter of Daniel there is a question asked, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice?" &c. "And he said unto me, Unto two thousand three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. Now how much of these two thousand three hundred years has been fulfilled? The same Prophet says, "Seventy weeks are determined on thy people." Now in the midst of Daniel's seventieth week was Messiah cut off, leaving one half a week, or three years and a half of the seventy to be fulfilled after the crucifixion of Christ. We begin our calculation of time from the birth of Christ, and Daniel's seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, ends in the 37th year of the Christian Era. These thirty-seven years, taken from the 490, leaves 453; that this much of the long vision was fulfilled previous to the birth of Christ, and there must have remained after the birth of Christ 1847, to complete the 2300 years, when the sanctuary is to be cleansed, or the downfall of Antichrist to take place.

Now if Antichrist is to fall at this time, he must have reigned the twelve hundred and sixty years previous to the year 1847; and by counting back twelve hundred and sixty years, we are brought to the year 587. About this very time the church elected a Universal Bishop, and this Bishop and his successors have been reigning at Rome, the seat of Antichrist, ever since. About the year 1847 Daniel's long vision will end, and about this time will the son of perdition finish his bloody and tyrannical reign.

[*To be continued.*]

Notes on a Tour to New York, via Eastern Virginia---No. I.

LEFT Bethany on the 4th of October, in company with Thomas Campbell, Sen. Dr. B. F. Hall, R. Y. Henley, M. L. Henley, and E.

A. Campbell, on a tour to Eastern Virginia. After an agreeable journey over the mountains, excepting two days' rain, we safely arrived at Fredericksburg on Saturday evening, the 12th instant. Our arrival on that evening being unexpected by the brethren there, (as my letters had not arrived,) and the citizens consequently being wholly uninformed of our intentions, the congregation assembled on Lord's day morning was composed of the brethren and a portion of the citizens of the town. On Saturday evening we had the pleasure of hearing an excellent address from our beloved brother, *Peter Ainslie*, to the brethren and citizens assembled in the meeting-house. The evening being disagreeable, the congregation was small.

The disciples met on the Lord's day, as their custom here is, to break the loaf in commemoration of the Lord, and to keep the ordinances as delivered to them by the Apostles. As a good many citizens not members of the church were present, after the worship of the morning, I addressed the whole audience from Matth. xi. on *the character of the times*. In the afternoon I was followed by Father Campbell, on "*the means of enjoying the salvation of God.*" At night, by brother Hall, on "*the necessity and felicity of union among Christians.*" Monday morning brother Hall lectured on the virtue of obedience, illustrated from Old and New Testaments. In the afternoon, Father Campbell on "the means of redemption." At night a large concourse was addressed by myself on the infallible criterion of the original gospel. One lady in the afternoon of that day confessed the Lord, and was immersed in the Rappahannock river.

The disciples here, who have been driven into their duty by the intolerance of the ecclesiastic counsellors of the Dover Association, are now going on most affectionately, with one heart and soul, in the school of Christ. They are now about thirty-six in number, gradually increasing in number, and growing in the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ our blessed Lord. They declare that they now enjoy themselves and their religion inexpressively more since their exclusion from their quondam brethren, than while among them; for now they experience that freedom and liberty in the Lord which he promised them who obey *him* rather than *men*. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed," is a saying of the Lord Messiah, which they now more fully understand.

The brethren in Fredericksburg have erected a very commodious and neat brick meeting-house during the past summer, on the ground on which the old Theatre stood, and, by their zealous and enterprizing efforts, have nearly succeeded in paying for it. It cost them about 2500 dollars, of which about 2000 dollars have been already paid.

The old church, from which they were separated, is yet in a state of fermentation. The old leaven and the new are both at work. The Dover Decrees, under the direction of the Travelling Council, composed of John Kerr, Philip Montague, J. Micon & Co. have quenched the spirit of religion in the Old Baptists, and of veneration on the part of the people; so that they who love the Lord, and will keep his commandments, are coming out from among them. The mortal remains,

who call themselves "the Elect of Fredericksburg," are now attempting to keep themselves alive by a circulating ministry, composed of four preachers—one for every Sunday in the month. These are all under the control of one officer, who unites in himself the functions of moderator, clerk, deacon, and supreme director of fifteen.

The itinerant council and perpetual committee of the order of the Dover Decrees, who volunteered to divide the church in Fredericksburgh, have made themselves so popular in the work of division, that their President is now a sort of Universal Bishop, without any special charge in the commonwealth of Virginia; and in all places where they are known, report says, they are more feared than loved by all the population.

From Fredericksburg we proceeded on to the Bowling Green, in Caroline county, and on Wednesday the 16th we visited the church called Antioch. Although it rained all the morning and almost all the day, we had a respectable congregation, some persons having come from 14 to 20 miles; amongst whom was our indefatigable and much beloved brother, Thomas M. Henley. The congregation was addressed for some time from Colos. chaps. i. & ii. on the peerless glory of the Head of the Christian Institution; demonstrating that all and every defection in Christianity arose from erroneous views of the personal and official glory of him in whom all the fulness of Deity substantially resides. After my address to the congregation, we repaired to the hospitable mansion of Jordane Woolfolk, Esq. with whose amiable and accomplished cousin (Pichigrieu Woolfolk) we had spent the preceding evening. These gentlemen, but for the broils and animosities of sectarianism, would doubtless long since have followed the example of their amiable consorts in bowing to the authority of the Eternal King.

From the Bowling Green we hastened next morning 14 miles, to Newton, King & Queen, where we addressed an attentive audience, on Romans, chap. v.—whence we took occasion to show how much we lost in Adam the first, and how much we gained in Adam the second. After spending a pleasant evening with our brother Lee Boulware, next day we proceeded to Essex, to brother Henley's.

We should have observed that the church at Antioch has erected for itself a commodious and comfortable meeting-house. The brethren meet weekly in honor of our Lord, and break the loaf of blessing. They are in number about forty. This is a new church, which arose out of the world by the instrumentality of the old gospel, and was never connected with the Old Baptist Associations. This congregation and that in Fredericksburg are visited occasionally by brother Ainslie. They have, however, one elder in Antioch and two in Fredericksburg, chosen from among themselves, whose business it is to preside over the congregation.

At Newton there has recently been set up a small church. Some seven or eight hundred dollars have been subscribed for the erection of a meeting-house, which will probably be erected in the ensuing summer.

On Saturday the 19th, we addressed a congregation assembled in the house of brother Henley, on the subject of conversion to the Lord, from the 3d chapter of the Acts of Apostles.

Appointments were made for Rappahannock and Smyrna on the 20th and 21st, each distant about twenty miles, where the brethren have erected for themselves substantial and neat brick meeting-houses. Also an appointment was made at Aquinton, in King William, for the 22d of the month. We also intended to visit Mangohick; but in consequence of a continued rain for sixty hours, we failed in visiting the brethren in any of these congregations. By a mistake the appointments for Aquinton and Bethesda were published for the 23d; and by this means, at the former place, we understood, a large congregation was disappointed. At Bethesda we addressed a crowded house, from Rom. ii. on human responsibility and the object of the divine goodness bestowed on all men. This congregation was originally a part of the church called Black Creek, which church had two places of meeting. When they parted they divided the spoil, and the house in which we spoke belongs to the brethren at Bethesda, about one hundred in number.

At this place, ten miles from Richmond, we had the pleasure of meeting our beloved brother David S. Burnett, and a number of our brethren from the city. After the discourse we hastened on to our brother Curtis Curtis, within four miles of the city, with whom we were much refreshed.

On the next evening, by previous appointment, we addressed the brethren and citizens of Richmond, in the new meeting-house, called from the Sycamore tree which throws its refreshing shade over the entrance to its doors. This large and comfortable house, 50 by 70 feet, two stories high, was well filled with an attentive audience. Our address in the evening was introductory to the object of the meeting which was to commence on the next day. Certain great preliminary questions concerning God's communications to men—the variety of messages he had sent—the persons by whom—the manner in which he had spoken to men—the intelligibility of his addresses—their suitableness to our condition—and, above all, the profound reverence with which his last communication to men by his Son should be regarded, fell in our way in opening the meeting.

Next morning, at 11 oclock A. M. Father Campbell addressed the audience on 'sin and its cure,' in the character of a disease, from various passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the evening Dr. Hall spoke from 1 Cor. i. on the great advantages of union and co-operation amongst Christians, and the melancholy effects of divisions.

Saturday morning we addressed the congregation on the good combat of faith, the Christian armor, and the use of it in wrestling against the rulers of this present darkness and the powers arrayed against the designs of Heaven in the salvation of men. Eph. vi.

Brother Du Val in the evening spoke from Hebrews, 1st and 2d chapters, showing that all speculations on human ability and inability were wholly useless in the work of conversion; and that the believing

of the truth, obeying the commands of Jesus Christ, and following his example, are the grand requisites in order to the enjoyment of salvation.

Lord's day, after the worship of the morning, and the commemoration of the death and resurrection of the Saviour, we addressed a very crowded house, on *the three kingdoms of nature, grace, and glory;* showing the analogies existing between them—that the object of each was to form bodies like itself—natural, gracious, and glorious bodies. Three births, three lives, three salvations, contrasted, illustrated, and conferred, suited to the genius of each kingdom. The constitutional principles, laws, ordinances, subjects, privileges, duties, and enjoyments of the citizens of each, were in succession adverted to; and the essential necessity of being in each kingdom to participate of its influences, was enforced from reason, analogy, and the third chapter of John.

Brother Burnett addressed a very crowded house in the evening, upon "one gospel, a remedy and an adequate salvation for all sorts of men;" showing what the gospel could and would accomplish, from what is recorded of its success in the New Testament. The accounts given in the letters to Corinth, Galatia, Titus, &c. of the sorts of character reformed and saved by it, were adduced in illustration and confirmation of its potency; and the rapidity with which the work of conversion was accomplished in the apostolic age, was relied on in demonstration of the superior efficacy of that instrument to every other in the work of reforming the world.

Monday morning, at 11 o'clock, brother Albert Anderson, of Spottsylvania, delivered a very feeling and touching address from John, chap. v. The majesty and glory of the author of our religion—the deep and profound veneration which ought to be cherished for his word—the manner in which it ought to be regarded—the offices of the Messiah—the greatness and grandeur of his salvation, contrasted with all the things of time and sense; with many useful hints of what sort of persons we Christians ought to be, enriched his lecture on this interesting portion of the testimony of John.

Brother Ainslie, in the evening on Monday, delivered an address on "the cross of Christ;" in which he set forth its import and influence in the Christian religion. Its power in renovating the heart, in taking away sin, in overcoming the world, were clearly set forth; and the necessity of Christians following the example of Paul in crucifying the world, and in being crucified to the world through the cross of Christ, was strongly enforced. A short address from myself, on "the Christian race," concluded the exercises of the day. Such were the general outlines of the didactic and exhortatory labors of this meeting. The house, large as it is, was, on several occasions, quite too small to accommodate all who wished to hear. Great good order and decorum prevailed throughout all the meeting.

There was one or more sessions per day of the brethren from the different churches, to hear the history of the progress of the churches and the cause of reformation in their respective vicinities. From these

reports, which were made by some of the elders or members present, we have collected the following abstract:—

Members from sixteen churches met with the church in Richmond. These congregations are scattered over a district of country running from Fredericksburg to the seaboard. The account from these churches was not sufficiently detailed to give a full view of their present standing, nor were even six or seven churches in the same district heard from at all, which are known to have thrown off the yoke of human authority.

But we were pleased to learn the following particulars from those churches which were present:—They meet together every Lord's day, as far as practicable, to partake of the loaf and to worship their risen Lord. They are generally awaking to the importance of the use of more efficient means; or, rather, of more devotion of these resources to the conversion of the world. The number of disciples belonging to these congregations amounts to about 1200. In this same region there are about fourteen proclaimers of the word. They are, however, generally confined to their respective neighborhoods. Brother Ainslie for the last 18 months has been the only proclaimer who seems to have been constantly in the field; but the field was too large for him, and therefore little could be effected in the way of conversion by labors scattered over such a surface.

Brother Burnett, who this summer favored the brethren of Eastern Virginia with a visit, in a tour of some eight or ten weeks, in the tide water counties, delivered some sixty or seventy discourses, and immersed about as many persons. The brethren from all quarters bear witness of the good effects of his labors through Eastern Virginia. He has strengthened the weak, confirmed the wavering, silenced many of the adversaries, and convinced all (who would hearken) of the excellency of the principles of the reformation. It would be of immense importance to the good cause could brother Burnett be induced to continue his labors as an evangelist in this region. The brethren are all alive to this subject, and no doubt every needful exertion will be made on their part to encourage him in the work.

The brethren who labor in the word in the bounds of these churches, are, Uriah Higgason, *Louisa;* John Dangerfield, *Matthews;* Matthew Gale, *Matthews county;* (none of these were present at the meeting;) John Bagby, *Louisa;* W. B. Webber, *Goochland;* R P. Elliott, *York*; Peter Ainslie, *Gloucester;* Thomas M. Henley, *Essex;* John Richards, *King & Queen,* Dudley Atkinson, *King William;* William Luke, *King William;* Dr. John Du Val, *King & Queen;* Albert Anderson, *Spottsylvania;* P. L. Townes, *Amelia;* C. W. Taliaferro, *King William;* Charles Hyde, *Richmond.* Besides these were present at the meeting, several elders of congregations, who occasionally preach the word.

We were pleased to learn that most of these churches were actually forced to withdraw from the Baptist churches; that in no instance did the brethren in the reformation, when they had the majority, ever cast out the minority. All the churches express much thankfulness for

the great peace, harmony, and brotherly love which prevail among them, and evince a full determination to follow the truth whithersoever it leads them.

One good effect of our meeting, was, the addition of about 25 persons to the banners of the reformation; sixteen confessed the Lord and were immersed; and nine other immersed persons, from the Baptist churches in Richmond and the county, joined the church in Richmond.

We are much encouraged in the work of the Lord from the effects which the principles of the reformation have already had in this section of Eastern Virginia in the course of a few years, and especially within the last two years. The brethren have exhibited much devotion to the truth, much liberality in erecting meeting-houses, and in the general support of the cause. For all which we would bless the Lord, and devote ourselves with more ardor to his work.

EDITOR.

Richmond, October 29, 1833.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Conscience---No. 1.

THERE are few subjects of greater importance, and certainly none less clearly understood by the greater part of mankind, than that of *conscience*. Some will have it to be innate—others, acquired. One declares it to be a divine and infallible monitor—another supposes it to be entirely the creature of education, and therefore liable to err in its decisions: while there are many who appear to doubt, and by their conduct make others doubt, whether or not there is such a thing at all.

It may be profitable, therefore, to direct our thoughts for a short time to this subject, and endeavor to obtain a clear, distinct, or determinate idea of it. For this purpose we will inquire, 1st. What is conscience? 2dly. What are its powers, and by what laws is it governed? And, 3dly. What is the use of it?

Before, however, we attempt to define the word *conscience*, we will offer a few general remarks upon the subject of DEFINITION.

As terms stand for ideas, and ideas are the representatives of things, it is certainly a matter of great consequence that we should have in our minds, when we employ any term, a distinct and determined idea of that for which it stands. For if we use words without attaching to them a precise and definite signification, we cannot expect that others should understand our meaning, seeing we do not understand it ourselves; and if our ideas be confused, it follows that we must have a confused knowledge of things, which is often worse than total ignorance.

But it is necessary that we should have not only a *distinct* idea for the term, that we may thus be enabled to give a clear definition of it, but also that this idea should be the *true one*, else we cannot give a *correct* definition. Indeed it is much better to have confused ideas, than wrong ones, let them be ever so clear. The traveller, who, in the twilight, is uncertain which of several roads to take, may happen upon the right one; while he, who, in broad day-light, makes a wrong choice, will be sure to go astray.

A want of proper attention to these matters has given rise to most of the controversies and differences among men, as well as to their errors and their misfortunes. It is a grievous barrier to unity of sentiment and fraternal intercourse, that there are so many different languages in the world; but it is still a greater

one, and more to be lamented, that people do not understand even the language they have spoken from their infancy, or the things with which they should be perfectly conversant.

If clear and correct definitions are of importance in any science, certainly they are particularly so in that of religion, upon a true understanding of which, our present and our eternal interests so much depend. Yet there is nothing about which men so much differ, and the terms of which are so little understood or so erroneously defined. Men first adopt some leading principles or opinions, to which all other ideas in religion must be conformed. All their definitions of terms, therefore, must be made to correspond with these tenets. Whether the definition be clear, or metaphysically obscure, is of minor importance—it must at least be orthodox. Thus: Is the doctrine of absolute predestination received?—The decrees of God are no longer "his written laws,"* but "his eternal purposes, whereby, according to the counsel of his own will, he has foreordained all things whatsoever come to pass." Is it believed that there is a special and irresistible call for the elect? Then "effectual calling" becomes a "work of God's Spirit, whereby enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Christ as freely offered to us in the gospel." Or is it imagined that none can believe savingly unless they receive this call? Then faith, far from being the result of testimony, "the confidence of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen," is "a saving grace, whereby we receive and rest upon Christ for salvation, as he is offered to us in the gospel." And these abstruse and unscriptural definitions are put into the hands of children in the form of a catechism, and carefully impressed upon their tender minds, until they become so confused by mysticism and contradiction, that they are totally unable to understand the Holy Scriptures.

Certainly every writer has the privilege of defining his own terms; and if he does not do so, the natural conclusion is that these are already well understood, and that they are used in their common acceptation. For if he uses words in a novel or appropriated sense, without stating the sense in which he wishes them to be taken; if, for example, he uses *immersion*, when he means only *sprinkling*; if he uses *royal priests*, when he means only *laymen;* if he uses *gospel*, when he means *law*, without intimating that he intended to have them thus understood, how is it possible to discover his meaning? And the effect will be precisely the same if we are made to believe that he does so, and come to the examination of what he has written, with such definitions already firmly fixed in our minds. But these system-mongers, not satisfied with making out definitions, metaphysically obscure or lucidly false, for the plainest terms in scripture, or substituting other definitions for those which are already given, go so far as even to invent new terms, which of necessity implies the introduction of new ideas, such as perhaps it never entered into the hearts of the sacred writers to conceive. And these conceits are solemnly delivered to the people as the doctrines of the scriptures—the true teachings of Christ and his Apostles! Thus the greater part of men, (for there are few who read or think for themselves,) are kept in ignorance of the truth as it is in Jesus, and are unable to give a clear or scriptural definition of any term that occurs in the sacred writings. Nay, these terms convey to their minds quite wrong ideas. And these notions again are not only wrong, but very different, according as they belong to different sects, every sect having its own definitions, and the Book of God speaking to every different denomination a different language. The term *church*, for instance, conveys to the Episcopalian the idea of a meeting house; to the Methodist, an assemblage of persons, some of whom have "got reli-

* It was brother W. Scott who gave this definition. On the same occasion he objected to the answer given to the question, "What is effectual calling?" Being immediately asked by a Presbyterian present, in a triumphant manner, to give a better one, he replied, "Effectual calling is just to call a man till he comel"

gion—some" of whom are "seeking religion"—some of whom have "obtained a hope" of remission of sins—some of whom have not obtained remission of sins; but all of whom are under the government of a Preacher—himself under the control of a Conference, a self-constituted body of men, who presume to make rules and regulations for many different churches: while, to the Christian, it implies a congregation of saints—those who have believed in Christ and been immersed, as he has commanded, for the remission of sins; and who can, from the least to the greatest, apply to themselves what was said by the Apostles to the ancient churches—"Forgive one another as Christ *has* forgiven you;" (Eph. iv. 32.) and "I write unto you, little children, because your sins *are* forgiven you;" (1 John ii. 12.) who are neither seeking nor making a religion, being satisfied with that which is already made, and offered to all who are willing to accept of it, in the Holy Scriptures; and who meet together not to hear a preacher, but to attend to the institutions of Christ, being under his government alone. Thus it is also with the terms *presbytery, elder, salvation, justification, conscience,* and so on, throughout the whole catalogue.

It has been, therefore, the aim of the present reformation to restore a sound speech to the people of God, and it constitutes its highest excellence that it has brought men back to the simple language and true definitions dictated by the Holy Spirit—therefore, to the ideas intended to be conveyed—therefore, to the truths that save the soul.

ALUMNUS.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Fasting---No. 1.

INTRODUCTION.

"BELOVED, now are we the children of God." How great the honor! How great our Heavenly Father's love towards us, that we should be called *children* of God! "For this reason," says the beloved disciple John, "the world does not know us, because it did not know him. However, we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him;—that we shall see him as he is. And every one who has this hope in him, purifies himself even as he is pure." How did we attain to this high relationship? By being born of God by water and Spirit. Having renounced the Prince of darkness with all human leaders, masters, and teachers in religion, and vowed allegiance to the King of kings, the Son of God, we are free indeed. It is no wonder, therefore, that we are hated, slandered, reproached, and vilified by the world—that all manner of evil is said against us falsely for the Lord's sake,—for the stand we have taken on his side in this adulterous age. 'However, we know'—the ancient disciples knew and *we* know—that when he, our great Captain shall appear, 'we shall be like him—that we shall see him as he is.' 'Having borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.' But how do we know it? Because our Lord has said, "The conqueror shall inherit all things." And Paul, "We are not of those who apostatize to perdition; but of those who persevere to the salvation of the soul." And why not? Because we have added, or are adding to our faith courage, and knowledge, and temperance, and patience, and godliness, and brotherly kindness, and love. We have done these things, or are doing them, because we have in us this hope—this glorious *hope* of the appearing of the great God, even of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of being welcomed by him to those mansions he has now gone to prepare for them that love him. We know that he was holy, harmless, and undefiled and separate from sinners. Therefore, this is the character which we are perfecting in ourselves. We are not satisfied with having begun in the Spirit. We are pressing forward to the mark of Christian perfection. We are keeping our body under and bringing

it into subjection. We are continually looking to Jesus the great leader and perfecter of the faith. We are learning of him, and striving after conformity to him in all things. In whatever circumstances placed, What would Christ answer? How would *he* conduct himself? are the questions: and these answered, we speak and act accordingly.—*Thus are we 'purifying ourselves, even as he is pure.'*

Christian brethren, are not these the principles by which we are, and wish to be, actuated in all things? I presume to answer for you. They are. But, high as is this our heavenly calling and relationship, it must be confessed that we have yet too much of the grovelling character of servants: free as we have been made by the Son of God, the world is yet too much in our thoughts and affections: clear as are our apprehension and comprehension of some of the first principles of Christian doctrine, we still live in a dark and cloudy day—the most perfect of us have not yet unlearned all our sectarian errors, and we have much yet to learn as the disciples of Christ.—*A neglected lesson follows*—

"Moreover, when you fast, look not dismal as the hypocrites, who disfigure their faces, that men may observe that they fast. Indeed, I say to you, they have their reward. But you, when you fast, anoint your head and wash your face, that your fasting may not appear to men, but to your Father; and your Father, to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will recompense you." Matth. vi.

Our great Teacher in this lesson evidently speaks of FASTING as a *duty*. He supposes *occasions* for it—he gives some directions about the *mode* of observing it—and he speaks of a *reward*, as consequent upon the *right performance* of it.

Brethren, the subject on which we purpose to address a few short essays to you, is introduced. In our next we will endeavor to give a scriptural answer to the first question, which our lesson suggests.

ADELPHOS.

Bethany, Va. Nov. 14th, 1833.

Christianity in Richmond.

BISHOP MOORE yet lives, and the monumental church yet stands. Chief Justice Marshall is in usual good health, and attends church once-a-year. The *fashionables* of the higher casts of society occasionally visit the High Church, read their prayers, and listen to the organ. The Presbyterians have tried various projects to get up revivals and to enlarge the boundaries of their Zion in the South. In Eastern Virginia Presbyterianism is a northern exotic, and seems destined never to be acclimated. They still erect brick churches with tall steeples, and rear their horns like unicorns above the Capitol itself, though it stands upon a sort of Tarpean hill. The Methodists, good folks, are more humble, and take root in all soils. Their synagogues are lowly, but capacious. They catch the multitude because of their multitudinous accommodations to the nature of the multitude. The Catholics are rather in the rear. They are raising one brick Chapel of considerable amplitude, the first Catholic synagogue in this region. The other day, one of the leaders of that devout people, standing in the street, and seeing the masons rather remiss in their energies, shouted to them with a Stentorian voice, "Masons, take heed! You are working for God Almighty!"

The Regular Baptists continue to meet in two houses, called the First and Second Baptist Churches. Bishop Kerr's flock is now fed by Elder Hinton; while the former is engaged in milking the goats, and in pailing in the sheep in the lower country. Elder Taylor still holds the sceptre over the Second Church; and, indeed, they deserve the credit of sincerity. I have learned that this church (of perhaps a hundred heads of families) has contributed more than

2300 dollars during the last year, to what they call "the cause of Christ." For this liberality they are worthy of admiration. We only regret that they should mistake the object, and honor the inventions of men more than the wisdom of God.

From this church a *party* has rather broken off: in one sense of that ambiguous word, they are *dismissed* as in good standing to constitute a house or church for our friend Keeling. He, good natured and long suffering as he is, waxed wroth at the intolerance of some of his brethren in the *temperance* cause, who very *intemperately* pushed *temperance* so far as to get into a bad *temper* themselves; and *tempted* their brethren to *attempt* to build a new *temple* for brother Keeling and his friends. In Richmond we sometimes find *friends* among brethren, and *brethren* among friends: for in this latitude friends and brethren are not convertible terms. Hence *friend* Keeling finds among his many good brethren only a few friends; and so he and they, as soon as the house is tenantable, are about to become THE THIRD REGULAR BAPTIST CHURCH in the city of Richmond.

Names in Richmond are greatly above par. The name *Regular* will cost this party (say *thirty* in number) a large sum; besides an annuity of some 20 per cent. on the first instalments, so long as they wear that musical, harmonious, and melodious name *Regular Baptists*. The Pastor has declared that he could *conscientiously*, that is, if God alone was to be worshipped in the matter, break the loaf with the brethren under the sycamore; but as he must take into consideration more than the *object* of worship in the act of worship, it is *expedient* that he should never break the loaf with those brethren while on earth, but with those friends *named* Regular Baptists. It is better, in their arithmetic, to pay several thousand dollars for that name, title, and honor, and a few *opinions* connected with it, than to consecrate that sum to feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, or announcing the gospel to the poor. Why not rather fill the houses now erected in Richmond, than found a new establishment! Why not rather strengthen the hands of those who are resolved to keep the commandments of Jesus than oppose them in appearance and in effect, though it may be without design?

Mr. Hinton is from the land of Andrew Fuller, and is the patron of some new theory of regeneration, broached, as report saith, by his own brother in England. This new theory claims some merit for the novelty of the verbiage, rather (if I am rightly informed) than for any felicity of thought or newness of idea which is presented to the student of human theology. It is a sort of Fullerism on the operation of the Spirit, resembling Andrew on the Atonement. Its cardinal topics, I am informed by two competent judges, and also from the writings of the Richmond brother Hinton, amount to this—

1. Every man has full power to believe, love, and obey the Saviour, without any aid whatever from the Holy Spirit, save the written word.

2. No man ever did or ever will believe, love, and obey the Saviour, without the special operation of the Spirit.

3. This operation of the Spirit is *direct*, and *without the word*—wholly *independent* of any thing written in the book, and is but once in the course of human life—at the instant of conversion.

4. After conversion the word does every thing, works every thing, and saves the soul.

This is surely something worthy of a volume, and of the attention of John Kerr's brethren, and himself too. However, Mr. Hinton is a Regular Fullerite Hintonian Regular Baptist and a great opponent of reformation, because he is wholly ignorant of it, and will not inform himself of the matters in debate. He very prudently never lent an ear to a discourse during our meeting in Richmond; but with his pastoral staff was tending his flock, and guarding it from wolves and dogs.

The 1st and 2d Churches are better friends now than formerly. They can actually now salute each other courteously by the way! and if I am not misinformed, they have both prayed together against reformation! In defiance, however, of

all their efforts not to see the truth, nor let others see the truth of reformation principles, light is breaking upon them; and they will be forced out of their entrenchments if there be in public opinion any power, or in the spread of truth any speed.

At present the public mind is most outrageously abused by the whisperers, backbiters, and tattlers of this age and city, on the subject of reform. One says, 'These reformers are Unitarians.' Another, 'Take heed; they are Universalists.' 'They deny the Holy Spirit,' says a third. 'I heard one of them baptize into the name of the Father and the Son, never naming the Spirit,' repeats a fourth. 'There is no change of heart, no change of life, but *waterism* alone in their system,' exclaims a fifth. 'They are prayerless professors,' mutters a sixth. 'They are fast verging to deism; indeed, they are infidels in disguise,' whispers a seventh.

To disabuse the public mind of these and many similar imputations would require a standing committee of witnesses, itinerant night and day, with power to enter every house, join in every company and to interrogate every individual. This is not granted us. We must, therefore, patiently bear evil treatment, slander, and reproach, with primitive fortitude, and by our good behavior put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

Passing along the street, returning from a night meeting at the Sycamore Church, one says to his companion, "I will not believe even my own preacher again when he attempts to describe C———m. I never heard a man nor a people so scandalously misrepresented and abused as these people are. I am determined to hear them out; and if there is nothing worse than I have yet heard, I will do more than hear this new doctrine." Reaction will take place; for "the triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite is but for a moment."

Meantime, while the sects are fighting against one another, rather than against the common enemy, the Devil is triumphing in the whole city. Dissipation, gambling, and licentiousness are sweeping off thousands. A public meeting of the virtuous and moral citizens was held the other evening in the Capitol for the purpose of suppressing gambling. The laws and the preachers having alike failed to suppress this outrage upon the whole decalogue, the more virtuous citizens have agreed to coalesce to put it down by the omnipotence of public opinion. It is said more than a thousand assembled on the occasion. But how many gamblers were present could not be ascertained. More than thirty gambling establishments are said to be supported in the city. Success, greater than that which attends the preachers, attends this confederation against gambling!

The authority of the Bible is greatly lessened by the zeal of the sectaries for their respective *opinions*. Every thing now in religion is matter of *opinion*. No fact, no principle, no certainty—all *opinion*. 'I am of opinion that this is essential, and that is not,' is the *logic* and the *moral obligation* of the multitude. No authority—no divine authority is felt in the most clear and unequivocal sayings found in the Volume. What is your *opinion?* is the question.—'What *means* this?' say the most conscientious! It is not, What *says* the Saviour? nor, What *says* the Apostle? But, What does he *mean*—what is your *opinion* of that commandment? Thus totters the faith of the multitude; thus languishes the spirit of true piety; thus is frittered down the high authority of creation's Almighty Lord!

The Universalists (benevolent souls!) tendered us their meeting house in case it should be necessary to occupy a second house on the Lord's day—from sympathy, no doubt. We thanked them for the tender, but did not need to accept it. I wish these benevolent neighbors would take into consideration in what singular attitude they place the wisdom and power of God, in representing him as waging a seven thousand years' war against Satan in order to convert him at last into an angel of light!

In Richmond there are among the sects a few names which would honor the Christian cause, if they knew how to do it; but the influence of them who have

got as much religion as they can well bear, and more than they could wish, lies like an incubus upon their spirits, and prevents them from enjoying and exhibiting the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ. Peace be with them who love Jesus Christ our Lord sincerely!

EDITOR.

Richmond, Nov. 1, 1833.

Phenomenon.

Bethany, Va. Wednesday morning,
November 14, 1833.

THIS morning we were roused from our slumbers before the dawn, to witness an unusual appearance of meteors, or what are commonly called "shooting stars."

We were no sooner awake, than we discovered our chamber to be illuminated from without by sudden vivid flashes of light. Upon opening the window, a most beautiful scene presented itself. From the zenith to the horizon, through the clear sky, innumerable meteors were falling in a constant shower, bursting out in every part of the heavens, with astonishing rapidity, and leaving behind them long and brilliant trains of light. From the point at which they first made their appearance they invariably pursued the same course, directly towards the horizon, many of them being lost before they reached it, but some of the larger ones extending quite to its verge; and presenting on all sides, east, west, north, and south, the same glorious appearance of incessant parallel streams of silvery light.

A few of these meteors are seen occasionally, particularly in frosty weather; but on this occasion they were innumerable, and much larger than usual, exhibiting a most sublime spectacle. They continued thus to appear, without intermission, gradually becoming fainter as the east displayed more and more the glowing radiance of the coming day,

> "Et jam prima novo spargebat lumine terras,
> Tithoni croceum linquens Aurora cubile,"

until they finally disappeared.

During the whole period, the heavens were without a cloud, and the stars unusually brilliant. These, indeed, "declare" continually "the glory of God" and show forth his handy work; but it is "in reason's ear" that "they utter forth their glorious voice," and proclaim the power of the Author of the Universe. Few, however, there are who reason—few whose thoughts ascend from earth to heaven, to contemplate the spangled heavens, and learn "the wisdom of the just." They are regarded by most with a careless eye as common things which they have been accustomed to see from their earliest years, and thus make no impression. But are they, therefore, less glorious than the sight which we have just witnessed? Do they display less power, less grandeur, or less beauty? Why, then, should these extraordinary sights excite more wonder, or fill the vulgar with an awe which they never feel when they gaze upon the mysterious galaxy or

the brilliant morning star? Alas! having eyes, they see not; having ears, they hear not, either nature or religion, unless some uncommon occurrence forces itself upon their attention, to excite even then but a momentary surprize. And thus they will continue, surcharged with earthly cares, or buried in slumber, until 'the Son of Man shall be seen coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, to inflict a just retribution on those who know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ—until that day when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired by all the believers.' **R.**

It was, indeed, a grand sight! and doubtless can be very satisfactorily explained on philosophical principles. So can cholera. But is there no moral instruction designed by it? May it not be for a *sign?* Josephus, the Jewish historian, informs us, that, a short time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, many such and singular prodigies were seen in the sky. Among which a meteor man stood with a drawn sword hanging over that devoted city. The rumor and appearance of marshalling and contending armies, &c. &c. Now, if there was any meaning in those singular phenomena—any *sign* to the Jews, why may not the grand phenomenon which we just witnessed speak a word to Christians and to the world? The meteors of the ecclesiastic heavens are certainly shaking. They cannot long retain their places, and hold the admiring gaze of the deluded multitude. They must fall, and all their glory with them must soon die away. None but the real, the fixed stars, which cannot be shaken, will remain. Hark! what means that warning voice which we hear from the north, and from the south,—from the east, and from the west—"Behold the Bridegroom comes; go you out to meet him!" Awake! awake!! Deluded world, awake!!! We are not mad. Behold the Judge stands at the door! Such is the cry. "Heaven and earth shall fail," says the Lord of the Universe; "but my words shall not fail." To the word of the Lord are we now directed.—"The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall withhold her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall; and the powers which are in heaven shall be shaken. Then they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory. Then he will send his messengers, and assemble his elect from the four quarters of the world, from the extremities of heaven and earth."

"But the present heavens and earth, by the same word" (the same that formerly predicted the deluge) "are treasured up, being kept for fire to a day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men. The Lord does not delay his promise in the manner some account delaying; but exercises long suffering towards us, not desiring that any should perish, but that all should come to reformation."

We presume not to offer any explanation, nor to make any application of these predictions; but only add, after the first, the Saviour commands, "Be circumspect, be vigilant, and pray; for you know not when that time will be." And after the last, Peter says, "Seeing,

then, all these things shall be dissolved; what sort of persons ought you to be, in all holy behavior and godliness, expecting, and earnestly desiring the coming of the day of God." **F.**

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

RANDOLPH COUNTY, Mo. September 29, 1833.

I NOW sit down to write you a few things, and give you a summary account of our situation in this country. In the year 1830 I moved to this place and commenced preaching, and finding several brethren of the faith of the New Testament, in July I formed a congregation, or church, of about 24 members, in the following manner:—1st. Taking the word of God as written in the New Testament, as our only directory, as our platform, guide, &c. in all things. 2d. To renounce all sectarian names, and wear those names only that the primitive Christians wore. I have preached since as much as my situation in this life would admit of, and, blessed be God, not without considerable success. Our number is about 104 at this time, and the prospect is good for several more in my own neighborhood. I am the only proclaimer of the ancient gospel (as I conceive) in this county; and surrounded by the different sects, you may easily guess at the opposition I have to encounter. They labor hard to put down what they call *heresy* or *C——m*. And what are the weapons they use? Not those furnished by the Holy Spirit; but misrepresentation, detraction, slander, and abuse; consequently carnal.

I was at a meeting this day, where two of the Baptist brethren preached. Mr. Ratliff, the last speaker. took his text from John iii. 6.—and when he began to speak of being born of the Spirit, he said he was not an orator, and he would have to mention some of those views ((for he said there were many) that he thought were wrong, in order to make his own plain. He began with the Roman clergy. He said that the Priest took all those that joined him into a room, where he keeps a vessel containing holy water; he then takes a broom and dips it into the water, with which he sprinkles them, saying, "You are born again."

He next said there was one Alexander Campbell, some of whose writings he had lately read, who maintained that baptism was regeneration; and that if a man were to come and tell you his sins were pardoned, you would not baptize him. He also stated that you said there was no account in the Bible of any person's sins being remitted before baptism. He then went on to adduce some instances of Christ forgiving sins independent of baptism, and got as far as to the thief on the cross. Mr. Ratliff had forgotten, I suppose, when he brought forward those instances of Jesus Christ forgiving sins without baptism, that when the *Lord Jesus Christ in person* told people their sins were forgiven, they needed no baptism to assure them of it.

ALLEN WRIGHT.

ATHENS, M'MINN COUNTY, Tenn. October 2, 1833.

AS I am sure that you and the beloved disciples, who are scattered through the unfavorable world, would be, or will be refreshed by hearing of the progress of reform; therefore, as I am a lover of the truth, and also a friend to it, I now inform you that there are within this county two congregations of Christians who meet on the first day of the week in order to break the loaf and commemorate the dying sufferings of our divine Lord, and also observing at the same time all things whatsoever he has commanded. There are about sixty members in each congregation, and many of them in high standing among

men. There have been 21 disciples added to Messiah's kingdom since last July within this county. The gospel of the kingdom is gaining the assent of many, and much influence.

CHARLES M. K. WELCH.

NEW PROVIDENCE, Ind. October 15; 1833.

I THINK it due to you, as well as for the encouragement of others favorable to the reformation, to give some account of the progress of the gospel in our neighborhood, being what may be called a *string settlement*, between the knobs, on a branch of Silver Creek.

Some years past I became convinced of the necessity of doing better as a church, which I take to be the meaning of the word *reform;* and as well as I could urged the necessity of reformation. I soon found myself charged with *C————m.* I attempted, though in vain, to show the opposing party that it was *isms* I had fallen out with and was attempting to get rid of. You are so well acquainted with the course pursued in such cases, I need not attempt a narration; suffice it to say, I had no wish at that time to lose their fellowship, and tried, as I thought, in the spirit of the gospel, to preserve it; but, as they would not reform, I feel thankful I am not in their fellowship. Our church, ealled Muddy Fork, (by way of distinction) to which I have preached sixteen years or more, is with me in the reformation (so far as we understand it) except a few individuals. After spending perhaps too much time in answering the charges of the opposition, both in public and private, and in some cases challenged investigation, (which they affected to treat with the utmost contempt,) I viewed perishing sinners around me, and became uncommonly concerned for their welfare. I resolved to strike at error with the weapons that "are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." I soon found an increased assembly, paying marked attention. Last year my eldest son confessed the Lord, and was immersed in February. He was followed by two others. A concern to know the truth now became general. The result is, that through the season past I have immersed forty-four upon a profession of their faith in Christ. About twenty-six also have been baptized at two other churches that I attended the year past.

Our Association met on the fourth Saturday of August—done all the business it thought necessary in two or three hours—spent Lord's day and Monday in worshipping together. One hundred and ninety-six were baptized the year past—about seven the time of the association. I am very cautious in advancing, for I find we have yet much to learn and do before we can boast of being apostolic.

JOHN T. LITTELL.

DALTON, Wayne county, Ohio, October 16, 1833.

THE cause of reformation is progressing but slowly in this section of the country; nevertheless there are a few who have brooked the current of opposition and submitted to the faith once delivered to the saints, and are endeavoring to go on to perfection by meeting every first day of the week to break the loaf, and to attend to the edifying of the body. We are greatly persecuted by the sects. The number of disciples in this place is fourteen. The most of whom are growing in the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ. May the good Lord prosper our undertaking, and may all those who have embraced the Christian religion as it is contained in the New Testament, hold fast their begun confidence firm unto the end, by copying the examples of the Apostles as they followed Christ, is the prayer of yours in the hope of eternal life.

J. W. M'FARLAND.

CINCINNATI, October 24, 1833.

WE had in this city a *big* meeting, commencing on Friday last, and continuing until last Tuesday. Brethren Scott and Challen were present. Twenty-three were immersed, and the brethren much revived.

G. W. RICE.

NASHVILLE, Tenn. October 28, 1833.

THE good cause is still progressing here. On last night, after speaking in the name of the Lord, we repaired to the river, where four persons put on Christ as their leader. The disciples are adding knowledge, patience, godliness, &c. and progressing in the divine life. In my letter to you, dated "Louisville, September 4th," instead of here; it should be this state. I had been absent from the state for two years, and on my return in the latter part of 1832, I was not placed in a condition to go over the state; but on my return in July I was permitted to see many of the brethren, and I found the additions to the cause of truth far beyond what I had heard; and those persons were added according to the pattern found in the New Testament, and a vast number have been added this year; and it was to this I referred in that letter.

JOHN R. M'CALL.

WILSON COUNTY, Tenn. Nov. 1, 1833.

I SEND you a few things relative to the progress of reform here. The truth is advancing in the bounds of my travels, which do not extend farther than to an adjoining county. About one hundred have been added to the Lord by immersion during the last five months. Truth is mighty and will prevail. Go on—fear not. May the Lord help you!

EDWARD SWEATT.

CICERO, Onondago county, N. Y. Nov. 7, 1833.

THE good cause is gaining ground in these parts; but the opposition of the sects can only be imagined by those who have experienced the same. If Saul of Tarsus felt towards the primitive Christians as the different denominations appear to feel towards those who favor the reformation, I do not wonder he said he was "exceedingly mad against them." But the good cause will triumph in spite of the hosts of hell and the Pope combined. The fields are truly white, but the laborers are few.

Yours in Christian love,

H. JOSLIN.

Equality.——*An Extract.*

AFTER all that can be said about the advantage one man has over another, there is still a wonderful equality in human fortunes. If the rich have wealth, the poor have health; if the heiress has booty for her dower, the pennyless have beauty for theirs; if one man has cash, the other has credit; if one boasts of his income, the other can of his influence. No one is so miserable but that his neighbor wants something he possesses; and no one so mighty, but he wants another's aid. There is no fortune so good but it may be reversed; and none so bad but it may be bettered. The sun that rises in clouds may set in splendor; and that which rises in splendor may set in gloom.

☞Mr. Waterman's letter, referred to in last month's Harbinger, has not come to hand, in consequence of his absence from home. It shall appear so soon as it comes on.

☞A number of editorial essays and other communications, intended for this number, shall appear in the next.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number XII.——Volume IV.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. December, 1833.

Conversation at Mr. Fowler's.

Continued from page 538.

THE guests having sat down to supper, and while they were partaking of the good things which brother and sister Fowler had provided, father Goodal having asked leave to postpone the conversation on *Christian education* till after supper, said that he had a wish to have a little table-talk on the subject of eating and drinking, as intimately connected with the subject before them.

Mrs. Fowler. I am desirous to hear my dear father introduce that subject; for I anticipate it will be an apology for the simplicity of the repast which I have provided on the present occasion.

Mr. Williamson. Mrs. Fowler needs no apology for the want of any thing which nature, reason, or religion requires, if I may be allowed to form a correct opinion on the subject. We Americans are excessive in the indulgence of our appetites, and are a nation of gormandizers, rather than of philosophers, doctors, or christians. Our varieties of climate and soil afford us a great variety of the necessaries and comforts of life, and we think it is allowable to make a free use of what kind Heaven has with such profusion bestowed upon us; but I cannot but think we go too far into the business of indulgence.

Father Goodal. The present company and the present entertainment, according to an old tradition, must be regarded as excepted out of the jurisdiction of our present remarks; and, indeed, I had no direct reference to my daughter's table when I proposed the subject—though I presume she may in some respects fall under the *moral*, if not the *letter* of our remarks on one branch of the subject.

Mrs. Reed. "The *necessaries* and *comforts* of life" is a phrase which I have frequently wished to have explained according to the Dictionary and the New Testament.

Father Goodal. The *necessaries* of life are simple food and raiment; but as for the *comforts*, I think I will have to call upon brother Reed himself for a definition.

Mr. Reed. I find the words "*decency*" and "*comforts of life*" so vague, that I know of no way of defining the word *decency*, but by a circumlocution: "*Decency*" means something better than any of our neighbors; and "*comforts of life*" mean not merely the demands of natural appetite, but the cravings of every artificial taste—in a word, every thing which indulgence and the most pampered appetite may require.

Mr. Williamson. I presume Mr. Reed defines these words accurately, according to the acceptation of some, but I think there is something called "decency" and "the comforts of life," which, in our current style, means something less than superiority to our neighbors, and all the luxuries of life. To be *decent* is to be neighbor-like; and the *comforts of life* are the things which make us comfortable.

Mr. Reed. This "*neighbor-like*" is a very undefinable *like*. It supposes all our neighbors to be *alike*. But are all our neighbors *alike?* Are there only two of them alike? And seeing not two of them are alike, do we not want a model for this imitation we call *decency?* and do we not rather choose to be equal or a little superior to that neighbor that is most unlike the others in his ascension to full conformity to the world? If, for example, we have many poor, and one or two rich neighbors, is not *decency* to be like the rich rather than the poor? And how much does this want of my first definition of decency?

Mr. Williamson. I confess it looks a good deal like it. But are we not rather anticipating or forestalling father Goodal?

Father Goodal. You are doing very well. You are fast approaching the subject to which I would invite the attention of all. This conformity to our neighbors in "decency" and the "comforts of life," is the bane of the age. It must subject us to their fates, as respects our animal bodies and our earthly fortunes. If we pamper our mortal bodies with all the same comforts or luxuries—if we eat the same food, wear the same apparel, recline upon the same couches, and practise the same indulgences, shall we complain that our bodies are subject to the same maladies, tortured with the same pains, and destroyed by the same diseases which oppress and carry off our neighbors? We must be neighbor-like in pains, and groans, and maladies, if neighbor-like in all the decencies and comforts of life.

Or shall we expect that the laws of nature will be changed to protect *Christian* bodies from the plagues of *other* bodies, if, indeed, they are filled with the same elements of disease and premature dissolution? No, indeed: if in our stomachs we voluntarily introduce the products of the four quarters of the globe at one and the same meal—if we throw together the fruits of the five zones into this narrow apartment, we must not complain that the laws of nature produce the same convulsions, agonies, and conflicts in our clay tenements, which exhibit themselves in the persons of other sinners.

Mr. Reed. One would conclude, father Goodal, that you think that if Christians would not conform to the world in these matters of indulgence, they should not be conformed to the words in all the afflictions, diseases, and premature deaths which we daily hear and see are so alarmingly on the increase. Are we authorized to regard this as your deliberate judgment on this subject?

Father Goodal. My judgment, in one sentence, is this:—That if we obey Jesus Christ in all things, we shall all live to a good old age.

Mr. Williamson. I dearly love life; and if father Goodal will convince me of this, I will set out in good earnest to know what Jesus Christ would have us to do.

Father Goodal. You will, as a matter of course, perceive that I do not expect any miracle in this case—that I require a hale body to begin with. Some Christians, before their conversion to the Lord, have broken their constitutions by inordinate indulgence—intemperance, or excessive labors of some sort. Some vital organ may be impaired, some functional derangement in the machinery of life, may have taken place before the subject has come under the good discipline, the healthy regimen of Jesus Christ; but give me a hale convert, sound in his animal organization, and let him submit to the government of Jesus Christ, and all the laws of nature will most necessarily bring him gently down to the grave in a good old age.

Mr. Reed. Really, father Goodal, this will be a new and strong argument in favor of bringing up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, that they may live long and see good days in the world.

Father Goodal. Yes; and, brother Reed, this is one reason why children, having prudent and discreet parents, and obeying them, "live long in the earth;" or, rather, this is one reason why the first commandment, with promise, is that enforcing children "to obey their parents in the Lord."

Mr. Reed. You do not, then, expect any miraculous interposition in behalf of those who obey Jesus Christ. You only ask for a proper subject to begin with; and you argue that such is the agreement between the laws of nature and the laws of Christ, that he who obeys the latter must necessarily live to a good old age.

Mr. Williamson. No exception, father Goodal, for accidents?

Father Goodal. I am speaking in reference to the established constitution of things. I do not say that fire will not burn, nor water drown, nor that a sword will not kill a Christian as easily as any other man. But how far God may be pleased to guard those who obey him from all these things called *accidents*, belongs to the chapter of special providences. But here we speak about the regular operation of the laws of nature, and in regard to that remarkable accordance between the commandments of Jesus and the commandments of nature. We only now argue that every one who in all things obeys the Lord Jesus, will live to a good old age.

Mrs. Reed. Yes, father Goodal; but who obeys the Lord Jesus in all things! You may safely entrench yourself within this impregna-

ble fortress, that he who dies prematurely, disobeys Jesus Christ; and so an exception to your rule can never be found!

Father Goodal. My good sister Reed will not find me taking advantage of this impregnable fortress; for my views of this matter are founded on attention to the connexion that there is between a *general* conformity to the institutions and laws of Jesus Christ, and the means of health and life; and not to an unerring and infallible obedience to every commandment as a condition of good health and long life.

To explain myself. Temperance in eating, drinking, sleeping, working; temperance in the exercises of the intellectual powers; and especially temperance in the passions, affections, and desires of the soul, are essential to that healthful and vigorous exercise of all our organs and all the functions of our various members, so conducive to the enjoyment and prolongation of life.

Mr. Reed. Father Goodal, I presume you mean just as much as Paul meant when he commanded Christians to be "temperate in all things."

Father Goodal. That much at least. Let me just observe, brother Reed, that I wish you on some suitable occasion to give us a scriptural definition of the words *temperance*, *moderation*, *sobriety*, *meekness*, and a few others of this class which I shall yet name. At present we understand this word *temperance* well enough to understand each other, and you all apprehend my meaning.

Temperance is almost as essential to health and life as light is to seeing, or sound to hearing. But the government of the *passions*, as much as the government of the *appetites*, is essential to health and life. Anger, envy, malice, jealousy, fear—indeed, the strong or the long continued exercise of any one passion, is injurious to health. Some have died in a fit of anger; others by a fright; many have pined away under the influence of envy, jealousy, and the anxieties of life.

Mother Goodal. Anxieties! Yes, I have known many in the course of my life suffer as much by anxiety, as by all the afflictions which God sent their way. Their own anxious solicitude for the things which they could not procure, help, or avoid, has worn them down to shadows, and brought several of my acquaintances prematurely to the grave.

Father Goodal. Therefore, I have always commended your favorite maxim to all the youth of the neighborhood.

Mr. Williamson. What is that, Mother Goodal? I would thank you to let me hear it.

Mrs. Goodal. It is only a new version of Paul's commandment, "Be anxious for nothing." I have said there are two things concerning which we ought not to be anxious. These are the things we can help, and the things we cannot help. My rule of life has, therefore, been,—Concerning those things I could help, I did not grieve, but went and helped them; and concerning those which I could not help, I never grieved, because I could not help them. In this course I have escaped a thousand anxieties and griefs which have prayed upon the enjoyments of others.

Mr. Reed. And Mother Goodal's countenance and good health are the best sermon on that text which could be preached to the present audience, and to all this neighborhood.

Father Goodal. But while we survey the whole field of drawbacks on health and the enjoyment of life, let us not forget the table. On the table I often see fevers, rheumatisms, dysenteries, gouts, epilepsies, palsies, apoplexies, dyspepsies, and consumptions served up in style. These enemies of ours are often lying lurking under the covers of our dishes, and, with all the blandishments of the spicy islands, and sweet enchantments of the confectionary, are asking admission into our bodies. We are lured by such delicious rhetoric, and unthinkingly admit these enemies of our peace into our bosoms. Then we cry out 'We are sick,' and send for the Doctor, who comes with all the nauseating riches of the mineral and vegetable kingdoms, and pours them into our diseased systems. Thus we begin to pay the penalties of transgression, and to complain of the approaches of some chronic disease.

Mr. Reed. All this is very evident; but self-denial is a painful thing —and who can resist the enemy, when, with all the excitements of appetite, the arguments of modern cookery, and the persuasions of the host or hostess at each end of the table, he makes an attempt upon our constitutions?

Father Goodal. How can the Christian deny himself in other matters? It is, and it must be, the daily and constant employment of the disciple. Discipline, or the constant practice of the precepts of Christ, makes obedience in all things easy. I remember when I set out in the service of my Lord, some things appeared more difficult than others; but my youthful ardor and zeal in his cause inspirited me to make a stronger effort in reference to those more difficult acts of obedience; and in a short time they became more easy than those other duties, which, because of their apparent ease, I approached with less decision. My experience justifies me in saying that the habit of self-denial will become stronger than the temptation to any sinful indulgence; and to *begin* is much more difficult than to *proceed* in this salutary course.

Mrs. Reed. I am again reminded of a favorite sentiment of my own dear mother. Oft did she inculcate upon me that self-denial was the first requisite to good health, to true politeness, and to Christian character.

Mrs. Fowler. Then ought it to be the first lesson impressed on the infant mind. Then ought we by precept and example to enforce it upon the attention of all under our tuition and care.

Mr. Williamson. But I wish to hear something more upon this guide to good health and long life. I am already satisfied on the subject of self-denial; and I am almost persuaded to carry out my resolutions into practice: but I ask, How comes it to pass, if good health and long life are in any respect necessarily connected with Christian character, it is not ever presented as an inducement to the obedience of Christ by any of the inspired writers or preachers?

Mr. Reed. But are you sure that this is the fact? Is it not written, "Godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, as well as that to come." Is it not written that 'he who would live long and see good or happy days, must refrain his lips from evil and his tongue from guile;—let him do good, and seek peace, and pursue it'? Is it not written, 'Children, obey your parents, that you may live long on the earth'? True, indeed, the Apostles have higher arguments than these to induce men to obey Jesus Christ, and they are more frequently urged; but yet those promises of temporal good are used as motives to obedience.

Mr. Williamson. I had forgotten these sayings: for, indeed, they were never impressed on my mind as pertaining to such matters. So much are we under the control of our teachers, that our thoughts and impressions appear to be wholly dependent upon their guidance.

Father Goodal. A moralist, a mere moralist, once said, "Consider your body only as the servant of your soul, and only so nourish it as that it may become a faithful and obedient servant to it." This is good advice, come from what quarter it may; and should we regard the subject in this light, we would neither pamper nor indulge these mortal bodies, so as to inflame our passions, or to debilitate the powers by which our spirits are to exert their influence upon society. The healthy exercise of all our corporeal powers is necessary to the free and healthy exercise of our mental powers—either to our own enjoyment, or to our usefulness to others.

Mr. Reed. And this is all expressed in the *sana mens in sana corpore* of the Romans—"A sound mind is found only in a sound body."

Father Goodal. In a restricted latitude this is true; but I have found a sound mind sometimes in an infirm body—and a very weak mind in a very strong body. But the healthy exercise of the body is in all cases essential to the healthy exercise of the mind; and this is all that is necessary to my purpose.

Mrs. Fowler. You are all so much absorbed in the subject of temperance, that you have eaten a very light supper, and Mr. Williamson almost nothing at all.

Father Goodal. As I have engrossed so much of the conversation at table, permit me to add, that I think the subject of *temperance* of cardinal importance in the full extent of that word. The simplicity of my food, and the moderation of my meals—the regularity of the intervals between them—my early retirement to bed, and my early rising—have, I think, added at least ten years to my life—and at least twenty years to my enjoyment of life. These are, however, only the temporal advantages which I have enjoyed. I have found much leisure for meditation, for reading, for conversation; and the sum which some of my neighbors has paid in the way of Doctor bills, has filled the shelves of my library with many interesting volumes. Habit, moreover, has made the simplicity and regularity of my life most agreeable; so that for many years past, leave religion wholly out of view, I would not exchange my lot in life, as far as animal and

rational enjoyment are concerned, with the most luxurious Lord in his Majesty's dominions. But the government of the passions is no less advantageous than the government of the appetites, as respects health, morality, and religion. "The meek shall inherit the earth." This character I take to be expressive of one who governs all his passions, affections, appetites, by the principles of religion. But I shall leave this to brother Reed to decide; and only observe, that I never knew a gluttonous man, a winebibber, a man of ungovernable passions and appetites, reach, what we are accustomed to call, a good old age. The longest, and certainly the happiest lives I have known, were those who brought all their passions, appetites, and affections under the control of the Spirit of God, and carefully and conscientiously kept the commandments of the Saviour.

Mr. Reed. With David, then, we may say, "In old age, when others fade, they shall still bring forth fruit; they shall be fat and flourishing." EDITOR.

AMELIA COUNTY, Va. November 3, 1833.

Notes on a Tour to New York---No. 2.

AFTER Father Campbell and brother Hall set out for North Carolina, we continued in the city of Richmond and vicinity for a few days. On Thursday evening, the 31st October, we addressed a large congregation on "the original gospel," identifying the distinguishing attributes of that message which Jesus Christ delivered to his Apostles for the conversion of the world. We read the last chapter of Luke's testimony and the first chapter of the Acts of Apostles. After the discourse one gentleman confessed the Lord.

On Saturday and the Lord's day following we spoke to the brethren at Long Run, county of Henrico, twelve miles from the city. This church has been too long under the pastoral care of Mr. Eli Ball, of New England. This Mr. Ball has figured in Richmond as *Editor* of the Herald—as *Professor of the learned languages* in the new Theological School, now under the presidency of Mr. Ryland—as a *farmer*—as *pastor* of several churches—and especially as the *tooth and nails* of the opposition to reformation in Eastern Virginia. His brethren have, however, dispensed with him as Editor, and as Professor in the Theological School; and he has tried to dispense with his farm, that he may give himself more devoutly to his pastoral and opposition duties. But, unfortunately for his success in these, the better half of the church at Deep Run is on the side of reformation; and he has so outraged the public, that his removal from these regions will soon become a desideratum even to himself and his best friends.

Previously to my visit to Deep Run, at a Saturday meeting of the church, he adopted the most high-handed measures against reform of which Virginia has yet to boast. Under his auspices a committee was got up to wait upon those who read—yes, *read* the Harbinger—

to lay before them the danger and iniquity of *reading* that "pernicious and infidel publication," (I quote his words,) and to remonstrate against such a wicked practice, as preliminary to other proceedings of the church in the case!!! Nothing was said against reading plays, romances, novels—Paine, Hume, Volney, Robert Owen, or Voltaire; but "*the pernicious and infidel Harbinger*" must not be read on pain of the condemnation of the Rev. Eli Ball of New England and of that church over which he is pastor.

Mr. Ball also commanded, exhorted, and supplicated the church not to hear me preach—no, not to let their ears come within the sound of my voice. He finished the climax on this subject by assuring the church that it would *hurt his feelings* if they would go to hear me; and if all his other arguments should fail to convince them that it would be a sin to hear me, he alleged that this alone was a reason not to be slighted. Some of the brethren remonstrated; but in vain. He would not relent. He could not abandon the ground he had taken.

Without the knowledge of these circumstances, I appeared on Saturday, the 2d inst. and lectured on 1 John iv.—"Believe not every spirit, *but try the spirits*." If the spirit of Mr. Eli Ball was tried by the remarks offered in said chapter, without my understanding of these facts, I must attribute it to causes which I could not control. We had, after allowance for the rain on the Lord's day, a respectable audience at this meeting house, although the faithful servants of Mr. Ball obeyed orders, and staid at home.

The absence of Mr. Ball's party was fortunate for the cause of reformation in this place; because they cannot now misrepresent my discourses, not having heard them—because they have publicly confessed to all the citizens around them, that they are the servants of men—because they own and acknowledge that they will not hear both sides—and because they explicitly avow that they are unable to resist the arguments we have to offer, and must therefore keep out of their reach.

Indeed, the course pursued by Mr. Hinton, of the First Baptist Church of Richmond; Mr. Taylor, of the Second; and Mr. Ball, of Deep Run, (though that of the last is more superlatively absurd and ridiculous,) is a singular advantage to the cause of reform. Not one of these gentlemen attended one of our meetings. They are constantly preaching against us. The public now knows how to appreciate their labors. They will not hear; yet they dare condemn! Their candor, honesty, and regard for truth, are now confessed to the public. Poor men! their cause is desperate. They dare not hear, lest their people should hear and be converted; and to secure the allegiance of the few who are now under their control, they must sacrifice their standing with the public as honest and impartial men—and, consequently, lose all power of doing them good.

Hence Mr. Ball may as well preach in the grave-yard, outside of the walls of Deep Run meeting-house, as to the citizens of that, or any other vicinity, where his behavior is known. He may comfort the hearts of ten or a dozen, who already love, honor, and obey him;

but he has no more influence over that portion of the church who read and judge for themselves, nor upon the public who are acquainted with his conduct—than I have upon the decisions of the Emperor of China.

From brother Du Val's, of Deep Run, accompanied with brother and sister Webber, we proceeded on Lord's day evening to brother Webber's, where we addressed a small congregation; and on Monday, accompanied by them, I arrived at brother Pascoe L. Townes, of Amelia. Eight miles from his residence we have a three days' meeting, at a church called Paineville, commencing to-day.

Opposition in Virginia is fast defeating itself. No religious sectaries, without the sword, ever adopted measures more proscriptive, and more at variance with the spirit of the age, than do the Regular Baptists. The effect, in all cases, is as it always has been—the people see what manner of spirit inspires them, and lose all confidence in their ministrations. Thus, a four days' opposition meeting, held by Mr. Ball and Mr. Jones, at Deep Run, during our meeting in Richmond, passed off without a single convert. Indeed, it is questionable, with the evidence before me, whether these two last mentioned gentlemen have made ten converts in two years.

Even the good natured and talented Andrew Broaddus has lost much of his converting power in the neighborhoods of his opposition. He preaches for months without a single baptism. The great revivalist, Elder John Kerr, has exiled himself from Richmond, in pursuit of money to sustain himself and the Theological School; and, indeed, the loss of his power with the people in that city has rendered his new calling necessary. The brethren have only to proceed in the even tenor of their way, and their triumph is certain.

November 6th, returned from brother Jeter's, Paineville, to brother Townes'. We held our meeting in the 'Free Church,' as it is called. Our readers should be informed, that on several occasions we have been indebted to their Majesties George II. and George III. kings of England, for houses in which to hold forth the word of salvation. These colonial buildings, after the Revolution, were seized by the state, and declared the property of the commonwealth. They were built for the Church of England, but are now occupied, as the case may be, by the citizens who most need them; and when unoccupied by one party they are open to another. In this building we had a very respectable and patient hearing for three days. They were addressed on the 3d by myself on Hebrews x. 11, 12. on the parts of this connexion, which treat of *the principle of enjoyment* of all the blessings of the present salvation. On the 4th I continued my address on "the peculiar promises made to us Gentiles, which, if we believed, as did Abel, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, &c. believed the promises made to them, and act in accordance with these promises, as did those examples, we should be constituted the children of Abraham and heirs of all the promises in Christ." I was followed by brother Webber, who addressed the audience from 1 Peter v. on "the relative duties of seniors and juniors in the kingdom of Messiah," and on "the superior importance of causing light to shine from *works* more than

from *words*." He exhorted the disciples, one and all, to regard themselves as laborers in God's vineyard, and as called to sustain the Christian cause by their individual and social efforts. I added a word of exhortation. Three confessed the Lord; and two, before immersed, came forward and were received by the congregation. On the 5th I addressed the audience again, on "the history of the origin of Christianity, and of God's government over the Jews for more than three thousand years;" touched on various topics which the scepticism of this age and country required me to notice; concluded with ano ther exhortation, when another confessed the Lord. After the immersion of these confessors of the Lord, which the congregation observed with great solemnity and decorum, we dismissed an assembly which for three days listened with much attention, but with little apparent fruit. May the good seed scattered in Amelia at this time, appear in the harvest laden with increase!

Brother Townes for some years has been the only public advocate of reformation in this county. He has done much, considering the powerful opposition. Nothing has sustained the cause of reformation in Eastern Virginia but the sterling integrity and untarnished reputation of all its public advocates. True, indeed, there is, in proportion to the number of public advocates, and to the aggregate of the disciples, as much information and talent on the side of reform, as there is opposed to it; but so violent have been the denunciations, and so untiring the opposition, and so numerous the revivals got up on the side of orthodoxy, that nothing could have given to the cause of reform its present stamina and healthful aspect, but the unassailable reputation of its public advocates, and the general good character and standing of its professors.

Such, however, at present is the disturbed state of society—so violent the opposition—and so unsettled the public mind in this county, and some other parts of the state, that the gospel, however clearly propounded, cannot make much visible effect. The amount of argument and evidence which would, in the absence of these circumstances, bring tens into the kingdom, will here only give units. This is, however, the seed time, and it is a cold, dry seed time; moreover, the cutworms are busy under the ground; but, by the patience and perseverance of the husbandmen, a good crop may yet be gathered.

EDITOR.

Brother Townes', November 6, 1833.

Query on Theological Schools.

Dear Brother,

I WAS in conversation, some little time ago, with a friend, on the subject of educating preachers at our schools of divinity; and this inquiry arose: What is the reason that so few, out of the large number of young men educated for the ministry, seem ever to attain even an ordinary degree of eminence; while many others, deemed ess brilliant, and therefore not taken into these places of *improvement*,

far outstrip their former associates? The answer to this inquiry made by me at the time, and concurred in by my worthy friend, seemed so reasonable, that I have now determined to send it to you for publication, should you deem it worthy of a place in your paper.

The Answer.

If a plant, that grows tall and straight in the open field, where it derives light and heat from the sun, nutriment from the soil, and moisture from the dews and rains, all necessary to its proper growth and development,—be transplanted into a narrow box and placed in a darkened room, into which the light and heat, congenial to its nature, are admitted, alternately, only through a small window on each side of the room, and from which moisture is excluded, except in disproportionate quantities and at irregular periods; that plant will become pale and sickly, and instead of growing tall and straight and becoming a flourishing vegetable, as it would do if left in the field, it will, by bending itself first towards one window and then towards the other, in search of light, become a pale, sickly, and crooked dwarf. So, if a young man of strong natural intellect and promising genius, who, were he permitted to range the field of truth, untrammelled by the contradictory dogmas of partyism, would become a talented, forcible, and even brilliant advocate of the truth of revelation; I say, if such a young man is taken from the field where the word of truth is methodically and beautifully strewed by Christ and his Apostles, and transplanted into the narrow box of sectarianism, and placed in one of our theological seminaries, darkened by all their accustomed mysteries and obscurities, into which a ray of light occasionally breaks, sometimes from one quarter and sometimes from another; instead of growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, he is bewildered by the inconsistencies of the system, which he is taught to believe contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Thus trammelled by a creed of contradictory doctrines, the truth of which he is afraid to question, because "*anathema*" is stamped upon every thing not in the creed; the young man begins his studies by discarding the conclusions of his own reason whenever they contradict his creed. Hence he is often compelled to spiritualize and explain away the plain meaning of much scripture, in order to make it fit the mysterious speculations of his favorite system. He never goes beyond the limits of his creed in quest of truth, willing to believe it, whatever it be, and anxious to receive it, wherever found: but keeps his eye steadily—aye, cautiously fixed on the tenets of the system he has adopted. And since those tenets contradict each other, he is ever halting between two opinions—ever in doubt—ever guessing, and ever groping his way in the dark. Hence the brightness of his genius is obscured, the strength of his intellect greatly weakened, his powers of reasoning confused and bewildered, and he comes from school a very uninteresting man, and disappoints all the fond hopes and flattering expectations of his friends and relatives.

IREDELL.

The Confession of a Regular Baptist.

I WAS baptized on the 14th of December, 1824, on a relation of my experience as a Christian. Of my conversion there was no doubt entertained by our preacher and the church in B———, nor, indeed, by myself. I attended preaching once every month, and sometimes read a chapter in my family, and sung a hymn; but I had no gift for prayer. Our preacher generally explained a whole verse in one sermon; though I have known him sometimes explain only half a verse in one day's preaching. During nine years I had explained to me one hundred and eight texts—equal to two chapters in Matthew.

About two years ago I became a warm anti-reformer; and one year since, when brother A——— preached in our neighborhood, I would not go to hear him. I was a delegate to the Dover Association in 1831, and was consulting with some of my brethren on the best ways and means of putting down the reformers. Meantime I had a conversation with a very pious sister, who I thought was quite orthodox; and in the course of her remarks she asked me for a reason of the hope which I entertained. I related my conversion. "But," said she, what do you *hope* for?" "My salvation," said I. "Salvation from what?" she again asked. I hesitated; but finally said, "*From sin.*" "And," said she, "is the hope of salvation from sin, the hope which you now entertain?" I felt myself confounded: for it occurred to me that I professed to have had the remission of my sins before I made application to the church; and I could not distinctly say what I hoped for else. I took myself out of the difficulty by saying, 'I hoped for the salvation of my soul; and,' said I, 'is not this the object of your hope, sister F———?' "No," replied she—"I hope for something which I have not yet received. I have received the salvation of my soul; and for what a person has, how can he hope?"

I was afraid to commit myself by any assertion; for I felt my ignorance of the Scriptures in the presence of this sister, who, I knew, did little else than read her Bible and go to meeting; but determined on changing the subject. "Indeed," said I, "the Reformers have ridiculed this thing, called *Christian experience*, so much, that I have not heard much talk about it amongst us for some time; and it is now more than a year since I told my experience." "Well," said she, "I have never heard a *reformer* ridicule, or speak improperly, upon *Christian* experience. I wish our brethren would understand them on this subject. I am sorry that they so generally condemn without a hearing. Do you recollect what Peter has said on the subject of the present and the future salvation?" I was struck dumb. I knew nothing about Peter's views in particular; and could not even tell to what part of the Testament she referred. After thinking a while, I recollected of reading that Peter or Paul had said somewhere, that "*we hope to be saved by the grace of God;*" but being uncertain which of the two had so spoken, to get out of this difficulty, I said, "Dont you, sister, lean a little more towards the Reformers than you did some time ago?" "I always leaned to my Bible," she rejoined, "since I became a professor;

and have always been for reformation since I professed repentance towards God and faith in Jesus Christ; but have not been classed with the reformers, nor have I taken any part against them. I associate with all the brethren and sisters in the neighborhood, and would advise you to read the Acts of the Apostles several times before you decide finally upon the merits of the Reformation.

I determined to do so. Mortified I was, indeed, to find myself talking about that which I did not understand. I have now examined the matter with considerable care, and am amply repaid for all my labor.

I have conversed with all the members of intelligence in our church, and have found not one of them much more intelligent than myself. There is but one of them attends upon family worship with any sort of regularity. The New Testament is seldom read, except on Sundays; and a few verses only are explained in the course of a year. Our preacher preaches miraculous conversions, and quotes Young and Milton twice for once Paul or Peter is honored with a place in his discourses. He is very fond of harmonious sentences, and is smitten with the love of poetry. It throws such an air of fiction around his whole subject, that his prose appears as visionary as his verse; and, therefore, the admirers of Sir Walter Scott are better pleased with him than any other preacher in our country

But, sir, I have become a Reformer; and now I can pray with my wife and children, and I begin to delight in reading the oracles of God. I can give some better reason of my hope than formerly. My hope has for its object the future salvation; and the reason of it is, that he is faithful who has promised. But I need not weary you with a recitation so familiar.

If you think that these hints will be useful to any of your readers, you may publish them. But that I offend not my brethren, call me simply, THOMAS.

The Mother Church.

ANY one who wishes to see how the mother church gets along in her legislative councils, need only peruse the following notice of the preparations made and the purposes avowed. The mincings and apings of the daughter sects appear to good advantage in contrast with the mother. The spirit of our Baptist councils may be similar, while the body and the costume of the body differ in some attributes. We must, however, compliment this Catholic council with the characters of consistency and candor. They profess to legislate, and they honestly avow it. Our friends, the Regular Baptists and others, disavow such pretensions, but practise it with relentless severity. EDITOR.

From the Baltimore Gazette.

CATHOLIC PROVINCIAL COUNCIL.

This Assembly is now in session in this city. It was opened formally yesterday in the Cathedral. The Most Rev. Dr. Whitefield, of course, presided, as

Archbishop of Baltimore, and celebrated the Mass of the Holy Ghost on the occasion.

The other Bishops present were the Right Rev. Dr. David, from Bardstown —the Right Rev. Dr. England, Charleston—Right Rev. Dr. Rosati, of St. Louis—Right Rev. Dr. Fenwick, of Boston—Right Rev. Dr. Dubois, of New York—Right Rev. Dr. Kenrick, from Philadelphia—Right Rev. Dr. Rese, of Detroit, and the Right Rev. Dr. Purcell, of Cincinnati. The only Bishops entitled to seats, who were not present, are the Right Rev. Dr. Portier, of Mobile, (who arrived this day,) and the venerable Dr. Flaget, of Bardstown, the Senior Suffragan, whose delicate state of health did not permit his travelling hither. A large body of Priests, selected by the prelates as advising Theologians, filled the Chancel. The appearance of the Sanctuary was exceedingly striking: The Bishops wore capes and mitres, and were seated at each side of the altar. The Priests, in their sacred vestments, occupied the front before the platform. After Mass, the Bishop of Charleston delivered a discourse on the nature of church government, the object and utility of councils, and the peculiar benefits likely to arise from their celebration in this country.

The Prelates hold their legislative sessions daily, every morning at 9 o'clock. The consultations of the Prelates and Theologians take place in the afternoon at 4 o'clock.

We shall give more ample details of this Assembly, which is the highest local ecclesiastical tribunal of so large a body of our fellow-citizens. [!!!!]

An Address to the Saints of the Most High God, especially to the Baptists.

AS a standard-bearer in the camp of Israel, I think it my duty to give you a few hints on the tactics of war. Somehow or other several of your *silver shrines*, which you call "Minutes," have found their way into my part of the realm. I would advise the great *craftsmen* of the day to quit the trade of shrine-making and creed-making, and to take down their great coats before they are ruined by them. You take a great deal of pains to immortalize your idols by casting 250 or 300 shrines a-year to your great goddess Diana, which you call "Associations." The New Testament knows nothing of these things, only in prophetic vision of the corruptions that would privately creep into the church of Jesus Christ. We have no use for such idols in our part of the realm. The time is coming, and God is coming with his sword, in his brightness, when many records now called *divine*, will be committed to the flames, and authors lose their mighty names. My colors are the all-sufficiency and alone-sufficiency of the New Testament for the faith and practice of the disciples of Jesus Christ, as also for doctrine and discipline.

REUBEN SHORTT.

RICHMOND, Va. October 16th, 1833.

Beloved,

THE Lord's mercies have been over us and ours; so say your letters, and so testifies my grateful heart. I have been absent from Richmond about sixty days, and am now just returned. The

tour was laborious in the extreme, through a dozen or fourteen counties between this and the bay coast. I visited many churches, villages, cities, and destitute neighborhoods, preached sixty or seventy times; and about as many confessed the Lord as there were discourses delivered. Angels and men rejoiced. I think there were eighteen confessions after one sermon. This was reviving to a cause for which its friends were trembling, and over which its foes were exulting. The public (to the number of scores of thousands) have seen, and heard, and thought; and they have awarded to the reformation all it claims, as far as their judgment is concerned; and, as you see, many of them have surrendered their persons. The city of Norfolk opened its ears, and heart also, for the reception of the truth, as far as it could be imparted in two or three days. I lodged at the hotel, and preached in the court-house to all who could get in; and such interest took the constituents of one of the religious bodies there, in the matter, that a large majority of them voted out and voted down a series of resolutions submitted and pleaded by their Pastor; thereby exhibiting one of the first instances of ancient Baptist liberty of conscience in Virginia. The true cause of liberty is the cause of God and the people.

THE DOVER ASSOCIATION.

I attended the session of this largest of Baptist high courts in the world, having pre-occupied the ground for several days. It was in the ancient city of Williamsburgh, of classic memory to Americans. The naked walls of the old Capitol, at one end of Main street, and the old College edifice at the other, reminded me of Henry, Lee, and Randolph, among the orators; and Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, among the Presidents, who there received and repeated their lessons of literature, liberty, and independence—studies too hard for tyrants, and too abstruse for slaves.

The introductory discourse was delivered by Luther Rice, in the Episcopalian place of worship, one of the largest of the old colonial churches. Mark xiv. 41. and context, furnished the speaker ground for warfare, offensive and defensive, against the Unitarians, Universalists, and a nameless party, whose only sin was an undefined and undefinable error. If I am correctly informed, this was Mr. Rice's long promised, but first attempt at the extinction of the reformation. Nothing new, as you may suppose, in the form of reasoning; and the strongest argument I heard was a little advice to the keepers of the faith, concerning the treatment of this error, this non-descript, undefined, and unmet. "Dont be fastidiously delicate," said the orator; and 'the advice is gratuitous,' thought *one* of the hearers, at least. From such a *spirited introduction* some already augured a *fiery consummation.*

The Association was opened by your old friend, Broaddus—a man, I should suppose, of simple and unaffected modesty, an attribute that not unfrequently accompanies genius. However, his situation was rather unhappy, as Moderator of a vast ecclesiastical body, which,

like all other huge machinery, has no sympathetic feeling, no bowels of mercy. It requires a steady hand to rein the lion routed from his lair; but how terrific the king of the forest when unrestrained, but rather excited by the keepers! Mr. Broaddus was a constituent of the body, and all his unquestionable amiability to the contrary notwithstanding, he partook of its tender mercies—its iron sympathies. Indeed, a caucus convened before the morning service, had determined the fate, it is thought, of the pleaders for the Scriptures; and how could the brother in question, or any other benevolent disciple (of whom several came up to the house of contention disposed to rescind the decrees) exposed to the fiery forces that fashioned and projected the fulminations of the preceding session; I say, how could he and a few others stem the tide or quench the ragings of the burning furnace? Mr. B. is not fitted for controlling or correcting unruly bodies, and in this instance the *Moderator had to be executive of the will* of the caucus. Never did I so fully apprehend, or deprecate the miseries of perverted Baptist Associations. Not a civil or ecclesiastic body exists that more loudly disclaims or more tyrannically exercises the supreme power. The preacher, minister, or ambassador system has so far usurped the government of the church and Association, that personal consideration, *alias* the judgment of the flesh, determines the point in every case of litigation; and in such bodies there is no want of business. In some other sects the higher courts, synods, assemblies, conferences, &c. afford some prospect of justice in the end by a change of tribunal and the place of trial. But among our quondam associates a man for teaching the words of Jesus Christ, the burden of salvation, is condemned and punished without the liberty of speech or right of appeal, by a body of which he may, or may not be a member, and which, by its constitution and its avowal annually renewed, disclaims all, any, and every kind of authority over individuals or churches, further than the decorum of the session requires. Here liberty and right exist only in name; and, as the long shadow that dies at noon, disappears at the moment of anxious search.

Dover tender mercies and brotherly kindness gleamed in singular corruscations from the dawn of the session. The first item of business was the reading, by request, of the decree of last year, denouncing Peter Ainslie, John Du Val, and others, with the churches who should have the hardihood to give them a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple, or receive the message of heaven from their lips. And why this untimely resurrection of resolutions? Not, forsooth, that any immorality was chargeable upon the parties in question, for this the Moderator disclaimed; but an untimely judgment required the immortality of documents that would otherwise have lived only in the records of a degenerate age. Talleyrand or Fouche would have been amused at the scene that followed. Several speakers opined that the action of said resolutions cut off some churches that *they understood* remonstrated in their letters against the unconstitutional act. But as the letters lay unopened at this time upon the table in an undisguishable mass, it was difficult to determine which of them

should be consigned to the flames, and which of their owners should be decapitated. Various suggestions and resolutions were offered, and in the multitude of counsel the desired safety might have been effected, but for the unhappy candor of one of the party, who, I presume, was not in attendance at the caucus. The said querist simply asked, whether the Association could attend to business before the letters were read, as they contained the elements of which the body was to be organized. Moderator and moderated were much perplexed; and the by-standers were amused at the perplexity caused by so rational a suggestion. The chair was disconcerted, and the movers and the moved dismayed; and it appeared to me that the last conception and determination of the former were perfectly obliterated by the next suggestion of the latter. The dilemma of the chair was inconceivable; for as the whole structure of the proceedings accorded with the pattern shown at the Raleigh tavern in the morning conclave, the keeper of order unconsciously commended and sustained every measure, and when they conflicted, unmanly threw himself between the lines. Exposed thus to opposing fires and embarrassed by every manoeuvre, nothing but great tenacity of purpose, and some of that excitement which is necessary to the perpetuation of outrage, carried the point. The speakers of the occasion decided, with the assistance of the chair, that, as they had the old Moderator and Clerk present, the Association could pass resolutions. Just at this juncture, a lawyer, suspected of heresy, moved that all doubtful letters be laid on the table, until the others were read; but then forthwith have a hearing and their separate destinies be decided. This resolution was at first well approved; but the Moderator in stating it, discovered a difficulty. He could not see how the body not now organized, could by a motion control its proceedings subsequent to organization; and he curtailed the resolution accordingly, in which form it was carried. Although this turn abandoned the ground last assumed, and nullified the resolution itself, it was considered a happy measure, as it furnished a parliamentary excuse for the outrage aimed at, during all the previous twistings and windings. One man, whose voice has been heard in the council halls of his country, said, Let all the letters be read: but the justice and the forms of justice of political institutions were too stale for Dover, in meeting an error that invited scrutiny of impartiality.

From this time the parties involved in the unrighteous condemnation showed little anxiety for their fate; for as they were silent as death before the tribunal, so now with pleasing equanimity they awaited the associational decapitation or the finquisitorial special committee torture. Nor were they long looking for the blessedness of Messiah's promises to the persecuted; for about a half a score of churches were excluded or turned over to the kind forbearance of visiting committees, those harbingers of associational peace.

I had an appointment to preach that evening, at candlelighting, in the court-house. At an early hour the house was filled and surrounded, and before the usual time I commenced an exposition and history

of the reformation now plead by thousands, in connexion with notices of several passages of holy writ. After two or three hours I adjourned till the morning this school of Christ, for the exposition of the scriptures; *and by special request made by the audience*, at every meeting continued it twice-a-day as long as the session lasted, speaking about five hours per diem. In no instance could all the ladies get comfortably seated, or all the gentlemen get into the house—such was the anxiety created. I am told that I am much censured by the advocates of measures in the Association, for complying with the request of citizens and strangers at Williamsburg. But I felt myself imperiously called upon by the public to perform a duty I owed to the reformation, to my friends, to the disinterested, and to the opponents of Dover Association. I was actuated by feelings and anticipations differing largely from those expressed by two gentlemen in the Association, who acknowledged that they were afraid of the reformation, and that it took effect wherever it had a hearing.

A few churches have commenced keeping all the ordinances; but there is great want of system as yet. The new organizations bid fair to outstrip the old and reforming institutions in this work of heavenly emulation. One new church was formed at one of my appointments, and another during two visits, more than doubled its number. Shortly it may be truly said, I hope, that "Christ is made" to the disciples here, "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption"—that they are "complete in him." They are fast learning the wisdom of Christ; and must consequently, ere long, enjoy the completeness of his treasures of favor, in all his redeeming graces, commands, ordinances, relations, and promises. Let all the disciples of the Lord rejoice in "the hope of his calling, in the riches of the glory of his inheritance among the saints, and the exceeding greatness of his power in relation to us who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all government and power, and might and lordship, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come."

Yours truly,

D. S. BURNET.

To B. W. Stone.

Respected Brother,

I NOW proceed to close my reply to your animadversions upon my letter to brother W. Z. Thompson, concerning some prominent points in N. W's treatise on the atonement, which I consider of vital importance in the divine economy of salvation; amongst which is the scripture presentation of Jesus Christ as our Mercy Seat; to my definition of which you object; supposing that I translate hilasterion—*sacrifice*, because I use the English term—*propitiatory*, as an adjec-

tive, adding the word—*sacrifice*, and alternating these with—*mercy seat*, meaning Christ as "*sacrificed for us*," through which we find God propitious. Nevertheless you go on to add to the same effect, that "Paul represents Christ as the *true mercy seat*, from which God dispenses his favors to men—only to men who believe. From which mercy seat he dispenses pardon or remission of sins to the obedient believer; and from which mercy seat God declares to mankind that he can be just in justifying the ungodly. All this is well. But when you tell us, that "Paul represents Christ as the true mercy seat," why do you not with him tell us how he becomes so? Possibly you meant to do this, when you limit the dispensation of divine favors,—"*only to them that believe*." You do not say, however, what they must believe. You close your exposition of Paul's meaning by observing, that "from this mercy seat God declares to mankind, that he can be just in justifying the ungodly;" but you have not, with Paul, told us how. Now had you attended a little more closely to the Apostle's statement of this all-important matter, and availed yourself of his premises, Exod. xxv. 22. Lev. xvi. 2. Num. vii. 89. for explaining the antitype by the type, you would have perceived, that our mercy seat is also dedicated with blood, and that there is no approaching it to advantage but through blood. In short, that Christ is constituted our mercy seat only "through faith in his blood." Consequently, that without *this faith*, there is no mercy seat for *any*. Why have not the virtuous, penitent, believing Jews, and Mahommedans, a mercy seat by which they may draw near to God with acceptance and assurance? Surely it is not for want of faith towards God; but for want of the right faith, —the Christian faith; that is, faith in the blood of Christ, "which cleanseth us from all sins," having taken them out of the way; for, "he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" so that now they stand no longer in the way of a just God's showing mercy to an unjust, ungodly sinner; because that he can now show mercy to such upon the just consideration that Christ suffered for their sins—"the just for the unjust."—Having, therefore, made peace by the blood of his cross, by which he has redeemed, justified, and reconciled us to God, he is now become to them that believe in it, (like the mercy seat under the law,) the medium of the enjoyment of the divine favor; but to none else.—Proceeding thus, you would have also perceived how, from this mercy seat, "God declares to mankind" (yes, and to the angels too) not only "that he can be just," but that he really is so, "in justifying the ungodly."—Because, as aforesaid, he does it through the redemption which is by Christ Jesus; which redemption is his precious blood for, 'not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ are we redeemed to God.' 1 Pet. i. 18—21. Rev. v. 9. 10. Col. i. 21, 22.—Whom he has set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of his own justice in passing by the sins which were before committed through the forbearance of God; in order that he may be just, when justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus. The blood of Jesus, then, is the justifying consideration, which justifies God, because it was shed for the sinner's justif.

cation, being both appointed and admitted by God himself as sufficient for this purpose. See Heb. x. 4—10. It also justifies the sinner, who, admitting this, believes in it for his justification; so that, in the judgment of God, of angels, and of men, the sinner is justly acquitted; that is, justified, being acquitted upon a just consideration: namely, *because the just desert or wages of his sin, viz. sorrows, sufferings, and death, to the full amount of its demerit, has been inflicted upon, and endured by, his surety, the Redeemer.*

In this New Testament exposition of the divine economy, we are now, at length, furnished with a satisfactory solution of that otherwise insoluble paradox, Exod. xxxiv. 7—"forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; and that will by no means clear the guilty;" or, more strictly and properly, "that will not at all acquit." Now the word *guilty* being a supplement, instead of which, if we supply the word *unjustly*, we have the solution of this paradox, Rom. iii. 24—26.—"Justified freely by his grace, through *the redemption* which is by Christ Jesus; whom God has set forth a mercy seat, through *faith in his blood*, to declare his *justice*, that he might *be just*, when *justifying him* who *believes* in Jesus." Hence it becomes evident, how that God, in acquitting or justifying the ungodly sinner, does not acquit unjustly;—that is, does not clear the guilty but upon a just consideration. But if, instead of admitting the above, we retain the old supplement '*guilty*,' we render the pardon or acquittal of such absolutely impossible; for if God will by no means, or not at all acquit the guilty, who then can be saved, for "all the world is become guilty before God"? Now in this scriptural view of the justifying effects of the sacrifice of Christ, we find a just and obvious answer to your apparently *perplexing*, or rather *perplexed* inquiries on the bottom of page 228, concerning the nature and objects of its efficacy; for in this we see it has something more than merely a moral or suasive influence upon the sinner to lead him to repentance, call it by what name you please, having all the influences above described both upon God and man. In short, we see it justifies and glorifies both, according to the tenor and terms of the divine plan, as exhibited in the gospel institution.

In the last place you object to my reasonings founded upon the expressions and conduct of Jesus Christ, both in the garden and upon his trial before Pilate, which I used to prove that he considered the Father was the sole author of all his sufferings, first and last; as do likewise his Apostles afterwards. See Acts ii. 23. iii. 18. and xiii. 27. with Rom. viii. 32. &c. The Jews and Romans being but the executioners. Acts iv. 27, 28. You only attempt, however, to obviate my reasonings upon this branch of the subject, by rescuing from my "wrong exposition" a single text, leaving me in quiet possession of the full amount of proof contained in all the rest, as above. The text you select for this purpose is John xix. 10, 11. concerning which, you say, you have very different views from mine, which you submit for consideration as follows:—"Pilate said he had power to crucify him—Jesus denied that he had this power from Cesar, or from his laws: for he had committed no crime punishable with such a death. According

to the statutes of Cesar he was innocent. This power to crucify him, Jesus grants Pilate had; but he received it from above —What! from the Father above? No.—We have just seen this to be impossible. It was from another court this authority was given.—Not from Cesar's court,—not from the court of heaven; but from the highest court ever before established upon earth,—a court above all others, being divinely appointed. I mean the court composed of the High Priest and Elders of Israel. They, or their High Priest, delivered him to Pilate with authority to crucify him. He has, therefore, greater sin than Pilate."—Thus *you* explain. And to this I object in return; "Has not my dear brother given a wrong exposition of this text?' Where does the phrase "from above" signify any thing in the sacred style but heaven? Thus in the same Evangelist, chap, iii. 30. "He who comes from above, is above all." Again, viii. 23. "You are from beneath; I am from above." Rom. x. 6. "To bring Christ down from above." James i. 17. "Every perfect gift is from above," &c. &c. I would ask again, When or where is the term *above*, or *from above*, used to signify the Court of the High Priest and Elders? Again I ask, Could this court give authority to Pilate to *do*, what t had no authority, either divine or human, to do itself? Was it not for want of authority to inflict capital punishment, that it applied to Pilate to crucify the Saviour? Again, Does not Jesus distinguish between the power possessed by Pilate, and the person that delivered him into his hands? The former he said was from above; but not so of the latter. To the latter he attributes his actual delivery into the power of Pilate; to the former—the power wherewith Pilate himself was invested as a civil governor, which the Apostle assures us was from God. Rom. xiii. 2. Wherefore, while I agree with you that it was the High Priest our Lord meant, I also agree both with Him and Paul, that neither the High Priest nor Pilate could have had the authority, which, in this instance, they so greatly abused, had it not been given them from above.

And now, dear brother, I have done with my reply to your remarks on my letter; and can truly say with you, "It was not my purpose to attempt a reply to all *you* have written. A few prominent points only of your strictures have I noticed. There are a few gospel facts, which I consider as axioms; I have, therefore, doubted the truth of every doctrine, that stands in opposition to these."

1. That God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.

2. That he gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of our God and Father.

3. That he has redeemed us to God by his blood, that being justified by it, we might be saved from wrath through him.

4. That without the shedding of his blood there is no remission.

5. That by faith in his blood we enjoy, through baptism, the remission of all past sins, and ever afterwards, by the same faith, through confession and prayer, the remission of all such sins as are incidental to true believers.

6. That this faith has a reconciling and constraining influence upon our hearts; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; consequently, that we, who live by virtue of his death, should not henceforth live to ourselves, but to him who died for us, and rose again:—Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification;—by whose stripes we are healed.

7. That God having so loved us as not to spare his own Son, but to deliver him up to the most bitter sorrows, sufferings, and death for us all; he will, therefore, most assuredly, with him also *freely* give us all things. We therefore bless God, and take courage.

And now, respected brother, farewell. May the good Lord lead and keep us both in the truth! I little thought when I wrote to gratify friend Thompson, that it should prove an occasion for what has taken place between us; but I humbly hope it is all for good; and do, therefore, cordially submit it to the divine disposal, and to the serious consideration of an inquiring public.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

Edenton, N. C. Nov. 5, 1833.

Notes on a Tour to New York---No. 3.

[*Written on the Chesapeake Bay.*]

FROM Amelia, in company with brother and sister Webber, we returned to Goochland. On our return we spent one evening at brother Renns, of Powhattan. There, from a previous appointment, we found a congregation assembled, which we addressed from the close of the Testimony of Luke. The burthen of our address was, *the proper method of reading and examining the holy oracles—the importance of the most special acquaintance with the character of the author of the Christian faith—and the salutary results of an implicit submission to his authority and instructions in every thing.*

The day following, being the 9th of November, and very rainy, only a small congregation assembled at Webster's. The audience was addressed from the letter to the Colossians, demonstrating that all errors in religion arose from inadequate conceptions of the peerless personal majesty and official dignity of the Head of the Christian Institution. On the Lord's day a very large assemblage was addressed on *the gospel*—on the personal and immediate remission of sins—and the promise of the Holy Spirit. The day being very favorable, many heard with great attention; but only one lady came forward to confess the Lord.

Having spent the preceding evening at Dr. Card's, from the meeting at Webster's we repaired to Dr. Pleasants, where we had the pleasure of addressing a very attentive audience on "the conversion of Cornelius, and his family and friends." It is expected both these gentlemen have, ere now, submitted to the authority of him who alone can bestow immortality on mortal man, and done honor to themselves by honoring the Son of God.

On Monday, the 11th, we were conducted to Richmond by our devoted brother Woodson; and on the following evening addressed the church and a large assembly of the citizens of Richmond, on "the Christian hope, and the duties of the disciples in the work of converting the world." Our theme was 1 Pet. chap. iii. The principal points in this discourse were—

1st. That as Christian wives might, in the judgment of Peter, *without the word*, win over to the faith their Pagan and infidel husbands; so all Christians might, by their good behaviour, win over to the obedience of faith their unbe-

lieving connexions, companions, and associates, by the excellency of their characters, without any debate on the word or any controversy upon the articles of their belief.

2d. That the Christian hope is not the hope o remission of sins, nor the promise of the Holy Spirit, both of which are in the present life possessed and enjoyed; but that it is the resurrection of the just to eternal life, and the heavenly inheritance, which are objects of desire and expectation yet future.

3d. That this hope is a rational hope, and that every intelligent Christian can show good reasons why he entertains this hope; but these reasons are not his own experience of the fruits of the present salvation, which, however, he fully enjoys; but the promises and testimony of God, sustained by the various evidences presented in the written word.

4th. That it is the duty of *every* Christian to prepare himself to furnish reasons for *every man* who may ask him for the grounds of his hope.

5th. The antitype of the salvation of Noah through the deluge in the ark; or immersion as preached by Peter and explained in this epistle, finished the address.

During our excursion into the country brother Burnet had made some other additions to the church in Richmond, both by immersion and from the *Regular* Baptists, and the aspect of things in Richmond is at present very promising.

Elder John Kerr arrived in the city during our excursion into the country, and promised the people a revival if both the First and Second Churches would unite to pray for it. Mr. Kerr's skill in managing the passions, and his power over the nerves, is fully adequate to produce a revival amongst a population of the calibre of the large majority of his hearers. The old church reports nearly a thousand African members, most of whom cannot read a chapter in the New Testament; while not more than one African belongs to the Sycamore Church. In such a population Mr. Kerr's theory and practice are admirably adapted to produce a revival. The only thing to be apprehended is, that the intelligence of society may detect the policy of these manoeuvres, of which there is at present some ground of suspicion. The exhortation tendered in a recent *Religious Herald* to these churches, by the managers of the public ear, shows how sensible they are that every thing necessary to their success depends upon their having an exclusive right to address it. Hence the Christians under the management of Elders Hinton and Taylor are admonished to beware of hearing those who speak differently from them. The practice of hearing "the new doctrines of the day" is, say they, often dangerous, and always demonstrative of an unsettled state of mind, from the *appearance* of which it becomes all who would continue under their tuition, to guard themselves. Indeed, the efforts made to prevent the members of these two churches from hearing the brethren of the reformation, argue most convincingly how little confidence they have in their own ability as teachers, or in the system which they teach. Experience seems to have taught them one lesson of some importance to their standing, and this is, that if their admirers are permitted to hear both sides, their influence is at an end. Therefore, their pastoral caution is, *Hear only us, and then you are safe!*

On Wednesday morning, as the day dawned, we were conducted by our brother Myers, whose Christian hospitality we had so long enjoyed, to the steam-boat Patrick Henry. As we passed along the streets of Richmond a shower of meteors, called "shooting stars," seemed to irradiate the city. It literally rained meteors for some hours before day, and about six o'clock in the morning the scene was beautiful and sublime beyond description.

We had a very pleasant voyage down the James River, to Jamestown, where the first settlement was made in America, in the year 1607. There stand the remains of the first edifice raised for Christian worship in Virginia, if not in the United States. Here we were met by brethren Whitaker, Tabb, and R. C. Garret, Esq. through whose kindness we were conveyed to Williamsburg, eight miles distant, the ancient Metropolis of Virginia. In this city, where stand the walls of the old Capitol, which once resounded with the eloquence

of the far-famed Patrick Henry—where stands the College of William and Mary, in which three American Presidents were educated—Messrs. J. Randolph, Tazwell, and others of distinguished name—the ancient seat of the colonial nobility—we arrived at 4 o'clock, a distance of 120 miles from Richmond, in about nine hours. In the old monarchical Episcopal church, the most splendid and ancient of all the colonial churches in this commonwealth, we held forth to a large congregation the distinguishing characters of *the word of the Lord*, which began in Jerusalem. We were heard with attention; but as to the fruits, time must develope. We must notice with respect the liberality of the vestry of this church in accommodating the public with the use of it on this occasion. Especially is this liberality worthy of admiration on account of the proscriptive policy of the Baptists and other sectaries in this state, who imagine that in shutting the public out of their houses, they prove themselves to be given to Christian hospitality, and that they demonstrate the benevolence, honesty, and courtesy which the Saviour enjoins. But on another account was this liberality commendable: It is reported that the venerable Bishop Mead, of true Episcopalian dignity, did, not long since, inform his diocess that "the reformers in Ohio are accustomed to authorize females to preach and baptize," and did set forth various other grievous errors taught and practised by our brethren afar off, to some of the credulous members of the Episcopal church, in the city of Williamsburgh. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the house was opened for the accommodation of the citizens. So great liberality I have not found amongst the Baptists in Eastern Virginia.

After being refreshed at our sisters McGill's and Garrett's, the next morning, accompanied and helped on our journey, by our zealous and indefatigable brother Whitaker and others, we proceeded to Yorktown, some ten miles distant. In this town, of classic memory, on the environs of which Lord Cornwallis surrendered his sword into the hands of the American officers, which terminated the seven years' war for American independence—we addressed the full of the court-house of its citizens, on the resurrection of Jesus, and the end for which John wrote his memoirs of the Messiah. Brother Elliott immersed two females in the York river after the discourse, one of whom had consented to put on Christ before our arrival.

After dining with our amiable and zealous brother Nelson, who still inhabits the venerable mansion reared by his great-great-grandfather, the walls of which still bear the marks of the bombs of Cornwallis' army, and which was the residence of his grandfather at the time he signed the declaration of independence—we proceeded to brother Shields', on the way to Hampton, where on the next day we arrived about noon, distant from Yorktown about twenty-four miles. In this town we spoke in the Reformed Methodists' meeting-house, to a small congregation, on the official relations of the Son of God—and the necessity of beginning reformation at the beginning, or the right place. We dined with Dr. Banks, and at 4 o'clock embarked in the packet for Norfolk. We had a rough passage across Hampton Rhodes; but were gratified with a full view of fortress Monroe and the Rip Raps. After three hours' sailing we arrived in the city of Norfolk, and put up at the "Norfolk House," where we continued during our stay in the city.

The reformation principles have been but recently introduced into this city, and the opposition is very decided on the part of Elder Howell. Our brother, Dr. Hall, who returned to us here from North Carolina, had proclaimed the word with general acceptance to the Baptist church in this place for some weeks during the summer. Brother Burnet also delivered several discourses in the court-house. But on our arrival the Pastor of this church took so decided a stand, that he endeavored even to prevent us the use of the court-house on the Lord's day. This management compelled us to go over to Portsmouth on that day. We therefore spoke but twice in the court-house in Norfolk—on Saturday and Sunday evenings. On Saturday evening, Paul's account of the Apostacy, 2 Thess. 2 Timothy, and 1 John 4. afforded us a fruitful theme. On the Lord's day Paul's cloud of witnesses, and the faith

which saves the soul, furnished us with matter for two long discourses. We were attentively heard by large congregations, and left the friends of reformation in that city disabused of many unfair representations and incorrect views of the cause which we plead.

Our friend Howel, like many other Baptist preachers, abuses us, and yet preaches many of our views, as they are called. This morning I read his three sermons, published the present year, on the subject and action of baptism. The author has drawn heavily upon our debate with M'Calla, and never once given us credit for a single idea; and yet if one would extract from this pamphlet (of 80 pages) his plagiarisms from said debate, the balance would scarcely nauseate the stomach of a very dyspeptic Paidobaptist. He has not even always marked his quotations, a species of dishonesty unworthy of a Baptist preacher. The work, however, is well received as an able and convincing performance, and I have no reason to complain that I am immersed in Howel. I would as lief speak in the person of Howel as in the person of any other citizen of Norfolk!

It is, if we may believe many very credible witnesses, quite a common matter in various parts of the country, for a preacher, after reading his text, to introduce himself by putting his hearers on their guard against *new doctrine, novelties, Neologisms, C—isms,* &c. &c. then to fill up the measure of his discourse with views, illustrations of scripture, and sentiments, extracted from the writings of these "new doctrines" and "novelties," which he has just repudiated. Thus our views, when taken off our shelves, and carried into their shops, and *new-labelled,* are sold for sound doctrine, at a very high price. And this is all honest, and honorable, and fair dealing in the balances of the *orthodox* sanctuary. Upon the whole, we must say with Paul, "Whether in pretence or in sincerity" some of the distinguishing truths of this reformation are taught, "we must rejoice, and will rejoice"——— though—we would much rather see them taught by persons of more honesty and independence.

While in Norfolk we were very happy in the company of a goodly number of our brethren from a distance, who took up their lodgings with us at the "Norfolk House." But on Monday we had to part with most of them, even our brother Whitaker, accompanied only by brother and sister Todd, and brother Hall, who took their passage with us on board the Columbus, for Baltimore, 200 miles distant. This boat, of some 450 tons burthen, very strongly built, had quite enough to do in going up the Chesapeake to brave the wind and the sea. This bay is about 30 miles wide till we reach the mouth of the Potomac river. About midnight, when the wind arose to its greatest strength, and we had got opposite to the wide mouth of this imperial river, the struggle was so hard that for one hour sometimes the strong head wind and high sea silenced our machinery and triumphed over all our efforts to advance; but after yielding the point several times, we finally overcome the opposition and weathered out the violence of the storm. When day dawned upon us we could see Maryland upon our right and left; and now, at 9 o'clock, the cupola of the Capitol of Maryland, in the good city of Annapolis, rises to our view. And here we shall lay down our pen for the present.

The Lord be praised for all his mercies to us, and to all the children of men!

EDITOR.

November 21, 1833.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Fasting---No. 2.

"Moreover, when you fast, look not dismal as the hypocrites, who disfigure their faces, that men may observe that they fast. Indeed I say to you, they have their reward. But you, when you fast, anoint your head and wash your face, that your fasting may not appear to men, but to your Father; and your

Father, to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will recompense you." Matth. ch. vi.

THE first question, which our lesson suggests for consideration is, What is meant by *fasting?* What is the literal, obvious signification of the word—that which indicates the subject matter, and without which the *duty* (if fasting be a *duty*) is not attended to at all?

If now we were writing for *laymen*, we might refer for an answer to this question to the intelligent *clergy*—to all standard English dictionaries: but we write not for them: we write for the disciples of Christ, whose prayer continually is, '*Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?*' We *might* refer to the intelligent clergy and the dictionary; but this reference would be most unsafe on many words for them—on faith, repentance, baptism, for instance—on all that have been subjects of controversy. But we refer, Christians, directly to the Law and the Testimony—to the text and context of several passages in the Living Oracles, where the word *fasting* occurs.

1 *Samuel* ch. xii. it is written, "And David *fasted*, and went in and lay all night upon the earth. And the elders of his house arose and went to him to raise him up from the earth: but he would not, *neither did he eat bread with them.*" After this—"They set *bread* before him, *and he did eat*. Then said his servants unto him, What thing is this, that thou hast done? Thou didst *fast* and weep for the child while it was yet alive; but when the child was dead, thou didst arise *and eat bread*. And he said, While the child was yet alive, I *fasted* and wept."

Now, what can be more manifest than that David's fasting here spoken of, was *his not eating* bread? It was not his 'going in,' (wherever that might be)—It was not his lying all night upon the earth—It was not his weeping: for all these are spoken of as adjuncts, and distinguished from it.

Again: *Esther* iv. ch. "Then Esther bade them return Mordecai this answer. Go, gather together all the Jews that are present in Shushan, and *fast* ye for me"——How? We are informed in the very next words;—"*neither eat nor drink*, three days, night nor day: I also and my maidens will *fast* likewise; and so will I go in unto the king, which is not according to law: and if I perish, I perish. So Mordecai went his way, and did according to all that Esther had commanded him." Can any reader of this testimony —any *Christian* reader—persuade himself or herself to believe, that the fasting of Mordecai and the Jews with him, and of Esther and her maidens, here spoken of, consisted in any thing else, than *in abstaining from food and drink?*— Or, whatever else they did or refrained from doing, that it did not, and could not, properly bear the name of *fasting*, if they had eat and drunk during this time as much as was usual for them at other times?....We presume not. What need, then, have we of further testimony? Is not the question answered, and the point established, that "*to fast*" means "to abstain from food;" and "*fasting*," "the abstaining from food." Most certainly, this was the literal obvious signification of the word in the passages we have considered from the

Old Testament in the days of David and of Esther: and that it meant the same in New Testament times, one more passage from the Testimony of Matthew iv. ch. will fully establish. "And after fasting forty days and forty nights, he was *hungry*. Then the tempter accosting him, said, If thou be God's Son, command that these stones become *loaves*. Jesus answering, said, It is written, Man lives not by *bread* only, but by every thing which God is pleased to appoint." ☞*Jesus fasted in abstaining from food.*

"If fasting be a *duty*," we have said. A word or two now, under his head. In the passage last quoted, we are informed that *Jesus* fasted—that he connected fasting with prayer. If, now, *Jesus' praying* be an example for his followers; why not *his fasting* also? But more direct and explicit to this point—Matth. xviii. A demoniac is brought to the disciples: but they could not cure him. Why not? Jesus answers: "This kind is not dispossessed unless by prayer and *fasting;* plainly implying, that had they fasted as well as prayed, which was equally a duty to be done, they might have been able to cure this kind of demoniacs also. Again: ix. ch. "Then John's disciples addressing him, said, We and the Pharisees often fast; why do your disciples never fast? Jesus answered, Can the bridemen mourn while the bridegroom is with them? But the time will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then will they fast." Mark (ii. 18, 19.) and Luke (v. 33—35.) record the same question and answer—"They will fast." In other words, it shall be their *duty* to fast, and they will perform it. To the same effect, the Saviour's instructions, first quoted in the conclusion of our last essay, and placed at the head of this—the lesson, which we are considering: "Moreover, *when you fast*," &c. Why thus introduce this subject? Why the directions which follow; "Look not dismal as the hypocrites *when you fast*," if fasting be not a duty? If you know these things, happy are you "if you do them."

ADELPHOS.

Latent Scepticism.

IT appears wholly impossible to reconcile the behaviour of a very large proportion of the professing world to the faith which they have confessed. They say that Jesus is the only Prophet of the Christian people, and they will not hear him; that he is the only High Priest, and they will not accept his sacrifice as the reconciliation; that he is the only Lawgiver and King of Saints, and they will not obey him. They say that there is nothing more uncertain than the tenure of the present life, and nothing more certain than death, and yet they live as though nothing was more uncertain than death, and more certain than life. They say that this is not our home; and they are always seeking to make a home of it. They say that the present world, with the fashion of it, soon passes away, and that the future world is eternal and unfading; yet they cling to the present as though it were eternal, and act as though the future was fast fading and soon to pass

away. They say that the gospel salvation is worth more than the universe, and yet they will not part with their love of the things of time and sense for the full enjoyment of the assurance of eternal life. In one sentence, it is more difficult to reconcile the professed faith and the genuine works of the majority of nominal Christians, than the most apparently incongruous tenets of Calvinists and Arminians—of Unitarians and Trinitarians—or the contradictory dogmas of the ultra Catholics and the ultra Protestants.

The detection of this mystery has cost us some thinking and some observation. But John explains the whole secret in one sentence—"This is the victory which overcomes the world; even our faith. Who is he that overcomes the world, but he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God?" 'Not one, responds Reason,' 'Not one,' exclaims Observation; 'Not one,' exclaim all the Apostles of the Lamb. But "Every one that is begotten by God overcomes the world," affirms the aged, amiable, venerable, infallible Apostle John. Yes, every one—every one conquers by faith; and every one without it is conquered by the world. Faith or sense, faith or flesh governs all. Faith ascends to the skies—flesh descends to the grave. Faith refines, purifies, ennobles, exalts, emboldens, conquers. By faith we triumph—without it we are captives to this world. It is the only triumphant principle.

"Sir," said a gentleman the other day, "I do not know why I could not stand up in the congregation to confess my faith." "Perhaps," said the preacher, you had none to confess." "I think," he rejoined, "I believed all you said." "Why, then, did it not interest your heart?" "I cannot tell," he replied. "Well," said the proclaimer, "what do you think about such a matter?" "Of that, sir, I am not so certain." "Do you think," continued he, "a Mediator is absolutely necessary?" Then was the mystery explained.

And another—"I heard you with the deepest attention and with full conviction, and could not tell why I could not rise." "I can guess," said the speaker—"You did not believe the testimony." "Believe the testimony! Why, sir, I never doubted it in my life." "How do you understand the resurrection of Jesus, or of what significancy is it in the Christian religion?" said the preacher. "Really, sir, I have not so fully understood this subject; but will gladly hear you explain, sir, if you please!"

The preacher takes for granted entirely too much. "Many a lawyer," said our brother W. Reid, of Kentucky, now a Judge of the Circuit Court—"many a lawyer has lost his cause by supposing his jury knew more than they did." Our preachers lose many hearers by assuming or conceding that they believe that Jesus is the Messiah; or that they understand this capital position, when, in truth, they do not.

We have on the present tour awaked into active life, in some instances, the dormant or latent scepticism of our hearers, quite to their own astonishment, as well as that of their fellow-citizens. Numbers have said, with apparent astonishment, "Well, I thought I always

believed that the testimony of Jesus and the Apostles was worthy of credit!"

The popular addresses of the Doctors of this age are wisely calculated to cherish this latent scepticism. No draft is made upon the faith of the audience, and therefore they know not how faithless they are. Their taste for oratory is pampered—their itching ears are gratified—their patience is severely taxed—their powers of abstraction are sufficiently tested—imagination itself is exercised—every power, faculty, and capacity is tried—faith alone is permitted to sleep. But in the proclamation of the ancient gospel the preacher of reformation first addresses the understanding with the arguments and motives to obedience; hence the faith of his audience is tried. Every hearer is called to the exercise of faith in the testimony and promises of God, or to the obedience of faith. If the hearer does not obey the truth, his only rational defence is, that he does not believe the divine testimony. Therefore, very many are convicted of scepticism, and for the credit and honor of their understandings, they call for evidence that God has spoken to men, or that Jesus is worthy to be believed.

The experiment now so generally and so fully made, enables us to form a correct estimate of the value of the present preaching and teaching of Christianity, and of the religious education of this generation—from all which we are compelled to conclude, that the number of sceptics, or unbelievers, with the form of godliness, greatly exceeds the aggregate of those who sincerely believe the word of the Apostles. We are confirmed in this mode of reasoning by the decision of the Holy Spirit, who assures us that "if a person say he knows God, and keeps not his commandments, he is a liar, and the truth is not in him."

EDITOR.

Baltimore, November 28, 1833.

Catholic Superstition.

"Died, on Tuesday last, in the monastery of the Carmelite Sisters of Baltimore, *Ann Teresa Mathews*, in the 81st year of her age. She was born in Charles county, Maryland, in the year 1753, of very respectable parents; and from her tender infancy, she manifested a desire of consecrating herself to God in some religious community. At the end of the revolutionary war she went to Europe, and there became a member of the Holy Order of Teresa, which is esteemed one of the most perfect. She returned to America in 1790, and was one of the foundresses of the first religious house in these United States, which foundation has lately been transferred, by the Most Reverend Archbishop, to the city of Baltimore. She was a model of perfection, and a strict observer of the rules and constitutions; and of the *virtues* she practised during her many years of religious profession, those of poverty and obedience were the most remarkable in her, to the great edification of all the members of the holy community to which she was united. May the many virtues which she practised, during her long pilgrimage in this vale of tears, plead her cause before the Omnipotent Judge of mankind; and may she find mercy in the merits of her Divine Saviour, and be numbered among the elect of God in the mansions of eternal bliss!" *Baltimore paper.*

Was there ever a more luminous exposition of the infatuation of the religious orders of the Papal establishment—of the inanity, inutility,

and folly of the whole Catholic religion, than the above annunciation from the heads of departments? In the above we have a full delineation of as perfect an experiment as can be expected in an age, and an authentic report of its success. Here is one of the most perfect ladies of the most perfect order, of the most religious sisterhood, of the "Holy Apostolic Mother Church," who, at the close of a very long life, most religiously devoted to all the works of Catholic faith and charity, so that she was, in the estimation of the Most Reverend Archbishop and all the Priesthood, "a model of perfection, and a strict observer of all the rules and constitutions" of Roman Catholic *virtues*, dying without mercy, and out of the pale of the elect! So certain are the evidences of this, that the surviving saints and ministers of her communion are now praying that "*she may* FIND *mercy*," and "*be numbered among the elect of God*"*!!!*

Had this devout lady, some sixty years ago, "consecrated" herself at the Hymenean altar, and given her hand to some help meet, and performed to him faithfully and fully all relative duties, according to the constitution and laws of the Christian church, and thus honored the natural and religious institutions of heaven, how usefully, happily, and honorably might she have lived and died, and left behind her not only a report of her virtues, but living and efficient models of her influence, and active representatives of her virtues and good examples! There is no excellence in female character more useful, more honorable, more acceptable to God, than that which adorns the wife and the mother! EDITOR.

Baltimore, November 25, 1833.

Farther Testimony in favor of the Ancient Gospel.

PITTSBURG, 28th October, 1833.

Dear brother Campbell,

WISHING you joy, and peace, and much prosperity, as a son of God our common Father, and a servant of Christ our common Lord; I hasten to inform you (if you do not already know) that I have now the pleasure of recognizing you as holding in reality the endearing relation implied in the phrase by which I addressed you above—viz. a dear brother. It will be to you, and, I hope, to all the disciples of Jesus, pleasing intelligence to be informed of my accession to the Christian church—of my renouncing the commandments of men, and submitting to the ordinances of God in their real simplicity—of my bringing my neck from under the galling yoke of spiritual tyrants, who are lording over the consciences of many of the human family, and taking upon me the easy yoke of Jesus—and of my acknowledgment of the perversion of the ordinance of baptism by the Paidobaptists and sprinklers, and my obeying the command, "Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins." (Acts ii. 38.)

For myself I can say, that in this course of conduct, in this submission to the ordinances of my dear Master, my Saviour Prince Jesus, I have found peace—a peace which I sought for in vain from the miserable comforters in the splendid but very unchristian Presbyterian establishment, with which I was previously connected; but from which I felt it my duty to withdraw. Yes, I found that I must in duty withdraw, because they required of me an acknowledgment of a human creed—a creed, which, indeed, they pretend to be founded upon, and agreeable to the Bible; but which I found in reality to be (in part at least) contrary to the very spirit and letter of the Bible;—because this is a day in which there should be no winking at corruption, no tampering with sin, no hiding the candle of the Lord under a bushel; but all which I found I was expected to do (in some particulars at least) if I should remain amongst them;—because, although it is enjoined on Christians by apostolical authority, that "every one, according as he has received a gift, minister it to the others, as good stewards of the manifold favor of God." (1 Peter iv. 10.) Yet, possessing, as I trust, the gift of speaking, they would not permit me to occupy their pulpit for the improvement of this gift to the edification of the others—unless, forsooth, I professed submission to the Presbytery, (yea, in things unwarranted by Christ,) and should obtain authority from them, as if they were paramount to our blessed Lord, who is head of his church and the only lawgiver for her members;—because I could not feel myself guiltless, or hope for justification before God my Judge, if, by my continuance with the Presbyterian sect, I should be emboldened (as I felt I must be) by the conduct of those *called* ministers of religion and pastors of the church, in misleading the people, either from inexcusable ignorance or wilful blindness; and lastly, I felt it to be my duty to withdraw from the corrupt establishment, called the Presbyterian Church, that I might be free to join the ranks of the Reformation, with an ardent spirit in the freedom which Christ promises his faithful followers, and in the full scope of a feeling of universal philanthropy and Christian charity. Accordingly, though to the blasting of prospects once cherished—the displeasing of friends still esteemed—the unbinding of ties once held sacred—the risk of the scorn of many, and the persecution of others, I chose to obey God rather than man. I have left the Seminary and have cast myself upon God's condescending care, ready to go where he calls, and to serve him in newness of spirit with my body and my spirit, which are his. At a future opportunity I shall go into detail respecting my change; suffice it to say, the Presbytery of Ohio had resolved, without daring to state a reason for it, that my connexion with them should be dissolved; from which decision I appealed; but before carrying up the appeal to the Synod of Pittsburg, my conscience was resting—I had all the convictions of which you, under divine grace was the occasion, revived and strengthened by the instructions and appeals of a brother from Ohio, and was forced, for conscience' sake, and for the truth's sake, to submit; and happy, (I found,) thrice happy are they who the Saviour obey. I was inducted at Pittsburg.

I am, dear brother, yours sincerely, WM. BEGG.

Conversation at Mr. Fowler's.

Continued from page 583.

Father Goodal. THE future is the offspring of the present and of the past. The coming race of men are now in training. In the cradles and in the nurseries of this generation are the teachers, philosophers, statesmen, lawgivers, orators, magistrates, and kings of another generation. This, with me, is the irresistible argument evincive of the weighty obligations—of the immense responsibilities of those holding in their hands the destinies of future times.

Mr. Reed. Then, Father Goodal, you regard the parents of this generation as holding in their hands the destinies of the next.

Father Goodal. Certainly I do. For, brother Reed, if all the parents of this age were to discharge their duties only as faithfully as some of the present company have done, I ask you to tell what sort of a race would succeed the present; and how much more happiness would bless the next generation than has blessed the present or the past.

Mr. Reed. I *feel* better than I can *express* the vast difference. Wars would cease, and the fierce feuds and rivalries which now embitter life, would no more oppress the world. Peace and good will among men would be the order of the day; and how many and how great blessings would spring from peace, universal peace, and good will among men, the tongue of a Demosthenes and the imagination of a Milton, much more mine, would fail to describe.

Mrs. Fowler. It has always appeared to me good and valid logic to judge of the merits of any action, or of the utility and excellency of any principle or system of operations, by the effects which would result from it, if it were to be co-extensive with the whole family of man—if it were to be carried out in all its bearings upon the destinies of our fellow-men.

Mr. Reed. I am not aware of any exception which could be taken against this mode of reasoning upon relative duties. General utility is assumed by some moralists as the very standard of virtue. And certain I am, that there is not one precept of the gospel, which, if literally and constantly obeyed, would not be found in all its consequences most useful and beneficial to all within its reach.

Mrs. Reed. But in all these remarks you only increase our anxiety to receive some new light, or some fresh instructions how we may more faithfully and more successfully discharge those relative duties which we owe to our families. For altough we have not the whole destiny of our race in our hands, we have that part of it which is connected with our immediate descendants and those connected with them. I would, therefore, ask Father Goodal to give us the result of his experience and reflections upon the proper mode of training children.

Father Goodal. Does sister Reed require my views and observations on the whole subject of the training of youth, as respects the

physical, intellectual, and moral culture of children, or only what regards their moral or religious education?

Mrs. Reed. A few remarks on every branch, but especially on the meaning of training up our children in the nurture and discipline of the Lord—if you please, Father Goodal.

Father Goodal. I have attended to the last more than to the former, and can speak more advisedly on the Christian discipline than on the physical and intellectual culture—unless, indeed, you regard these as branches of Christian education.

Mr. Reed. It is only as branches of the Christian education on which I would wish, at this time, to hear you.

Father Goodal. It requires three things to make a man—a body, a soul, and a spirit. And to make a good and useful man, we must begin with the infant body, soul, and spirit. The usefulness of the man depends upon the physical endowments: for if a man were as wise as Solomon, as zealous as Paul, as eloquent as Apollos, if he have not corporeal energy, his wisdom, zeal, and eloquence are all lost to the world. Therefore, the intelligent Christian mother will attend to the body as well as to the mind of the infant man.

The deterioration of the bodies of this generation has painfully impressed itself upon me for the last thirty years of my life. The degeneracy of the body is only surpassed by the growing delinquency of public morals, and the more glaring apostacy of Protestants from the religious standing of our first reformers. The young men and women, my contemporaries, when I became a man, were quite another race of men and women compared with the present. The consumption, which is now the most common destroyer of our race—to which nearly four-fifths of the deaths of young men and women are now assigned, was scarcely known in all the county of Down. At the age of 18 I heard of a young female dyihg of "the decay," as it was then called, and I had to ask both my mother and father, and, finally, old Doctor Gray, before I could get a full definition of "the decay."

The various complaints of the stomach, liver, and lungs, of which we hear so much every day, (to say nothing of the many new sorts of fevers which have appeared among us in latter years,) fully prove that men are sinning against the laws of nature in a way and manner unknown to our forefathers; and while the fathers and mothers are so fast degenerating, we cannot but look for a still more degenerated offspring.

Mr. Reed. Let me interrupt Father Goodal by asking him if he has satisfied himself of the true causes of this general falling off in the natural vigor and energy of constitution, which is so much noticed and so generally talked of by the aged yet living amongst us?

Father Goodal. I have observed that it has kept pace with the use of stimulating food, ardent spirits, and narcotics. By 'stimulating food' I mean flesh meats of all sorts, spices, confectionaries, tea and coffee.

Mr. Williamson. Why, Father Goodal, would you proscribe flesh

meat. I have thought that the most strengthening and invigorating of all food. We Americans could not live without it.

Father Goodal. Yes, you are celebrated in this country, as well as our neighbors in England, for your love of good beef. But, my dear sir, with all due regard to your manners and customs, I must attribute much of the degeneracy of which I speak to the too free use of animal food in connexion with other things. It is owing to the very good qualities of which you speak, that it is so injurious to the health and vigor of our youth and the sedentary part of the community.

Mr. Williamson. I cannot understand how animal food can be so injurious when I have so much experience and observation in proof of its invigorating influence upon the human system. Why, sir, look at our American soldiers, seamen, laborers, and citizens in general, who eat animal food three times every day; where can you find a more athletic and enterprizing race of men?

Father Goodal. They are a very substantial race of men; and I doubt not that their living so much on animal food contributes much to their endurance of fatigue and to their great physical strength. But, sir, you have the hard-working and laborious classes in view, and I am speaking of children whose bodies are not yet formed. My observation assures me that the stimulating power of animal food, especially of the grosser sorts, which imparts so much strength to the laborious man of middle life, is the very cause why it is so injurious to children and sedentary persons of both sexes, but especially to females. How do you account, Mr. Williamson, for the premature decay of the teeth and of the beauty of your American females, as our travellers describe your people to us?

Mr. Williamson. To the influence of our climate, and to the too free use of fruit. The acids destroy the teeth, and our more ardent sun causes the roses on our female cheeks soon to shed their leaves.

Father Goodal. So we are told. But since our children have been fed like men and women—on animal food, on tea, coffee, and sweet meats, their teeth and their bloom fade and decay almost as soon in our climate as in yours. I, therefore, ascribe it rather to the mode of living than to climate; for in the same climate I see all the differences of which we speak consequent upon modes of living. Here the children eat fruit in abundance, and live on a vegetable and milk diet, and when arrived at manhood their teeth are like ivory, and the lily and the rose vie for precedency in their cheeks. There they are stimulated with beef steaks and fed on ham—drink tea and coffee, and at 20 half their teeth are decayed and the roses are withered.

Mr. Reed. But, Father Goodal, how do you trace the increase of consumption to this stimulating course?

Father Goodal. The drinking of tea and coffee, and the eating of high seasoned food, flesh meat, &c. over-stimulates the body, and, like the drinking of warm punch or ardent spirits, opens the system to cold. Hence the frequent colds of which we hear so much, sapping the foundation of good health, and predisposing to all those breast and liver complaints which have so rapidly peopled our grave-yards

within the last twenty or thirty years. I feel myself, brother Reed, emboldened to say, that the early and frequent use of stimulating food—of tea, coffee, ardent spirits, and tobacco, even when there has not been a very glaring excess, has shortened the lives of the majority at least an average of ten years, besides the numerous deaths by consumption and other diseases growing out of this epicurean mode of living.

If we were commanded to train up our children in the art and mystery of gluttonny, we could not choose a more rational course than our popular fashions prescribe. They are pampered according to the cravings of an artificial appetite, until they have lost all relish for the simple aliments of nature. Their little bodies are seasoned, and spiced, and stimulated, till they are filled with the seeds of disease, and made so inflammable that a little exertion or fatigue throws them into a burning fever; or they are so much exotics in their own climate that they are incapable of enduring with impunity its various changes from wet to dry, from heat to cold.

Mr. Williamson. How can they be regarded as exotics in their own climate? A note on this, Father Goodal, if you please.

Father Goodal. The bodies of all creatures, according to the regular operations of nature, are composed of the elements around them. But we will not suffer the bodies of our children to be composed of the elements around them. The products of Asia, Africa, Europe, and America are on our tables, and often crowded together into the narrow dimensions of an infant's stomach; and thus we build up their bodies with the materials of all climates and soils. Therefore, they may, I think, be regarded as exotics in their native climate, and more fit for the green-house than for the field.

Mr. Williamson. I must assent to this; for in my own city of New York the bodies of the citizens did not seem to be made of the same materials. The natives differed as much from one another as they differed from Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Italians; and, as far as my recollections now assist me, the difference was occasioned chiefly, if not wholly and exclusively, by their modes of life.

Father Goodal. If by 'modes of life' you mean food, raiment, and employment, you have got the whole matter. But I would not ascribe to food alone, to raiment alone, to exercise alone, or to the want of it alone, all those differences of which I speak. The combination of these all go to the making the bodies of our children. But, really, I feel myself gliding into the Doctor's department, or rather into the affairs of the nursery, and will make my escape into the intellectual and moral training of our youth.

Mrs. Reed. I am thankful, indeed, to Father Goodal for his remarks and observations on this part of the subject; for I feel a very strong assurance that unless the bodies of the young are nurtured and formed according to the reason and nature of things, their minds and their passions will be more difficult to bring under the control of reason and religion; and, moreover, their usefulness and value to society must depend upon their physical as well as their moral perfection.

Father Goodal. Yes, their *passions*, their appetites, their whole animal propensities are necessarily dependent on the elements of which their bodies are composed. Hence, perhaps, was prohibited the use of blood, when the use of flesh was conceded. Observation, however has convinced me that blood-eating and much flesh-eating tend to blunt the tender feelings of our nature, and to familiarize men with acts of cruelty. This may explain, in part, why the shedding of human blood was guarded against by a new law and penalty when God permitted the use of flesh.

Mr. Reed. Would not this go to prohibit the use of flesh altogether?

Father Goodal. Very much indeed; especially in the infancy of man. But I do not feel authorized to proscribe any article of food which God has granted to man. I would only say, that in reason and moderation every thing ought to be used.

Mrs. Reed. I would then infer that Father Goodal would have us to nourish the bodies of our children with milk and vegetable diet, rather than with roast beef and plumb pudding.

Father Goodal. You may add an egg now and then, sister Reed, and, perhaps, once-a-week, a taste of chicken too; but your own experience teaches you that extremes are to be avoided; and, of the two, that is to be chosen which is the least to be feared.

Mrs. Reed. I confess that I am convinced of the unreasonableness of making children *exotics*, as you call them; and that while their bodies are in progress to manhood, they ought to be assimilated as much as possible to the elements around them. As a general rule I know of none more safe or more in accordance with all that I know of human nature.

Father Goodal. To guard against colds and consumptions, I will add, that nothing is better, in my judgment and in my experience, than abstinence from high-seasoned and stimulating food; especially before any unusual exposure to fatigue or change of weather. I never took a bad cold when hungry, or while living chiefly upon vegetable diet. But twice in my youthful days I caught a very serious cold by going out at night after a feast, in which flesh meat in various forms, and in highly seasoned dishes, made a conspicuous figure.

A sea Captain, of forty years experience, in all seas and climates, once told me, that he avoided colds all his life by taking care of his stomach, and by eating and drinking according to the climate. In the torrid zone he eat highly seasoned food, and very warm; and in the high northern latitudes he always took cold suppers, and avoided wines, spirits, and heating drinks of all sorts.

Mr. Williamson. Paul allowed "a little wine for the stomach's sake;" and might we not take a little too for our stomach's sake?

Father Goodal. *Very little* for your credit's sake, Mr. Williamson, and still less for your stomach's sake, unless when you visit Ephesus, and are reduced to that inability of which Timothy complained to his physician Paul.

Mr. Reed. I am persuaded that all stimulants are injurious to children, and that all stimulating food ought to be reserved for the decline of life.

Father Goodal. And if you would not make life decline too fast, you must not put more oil into the lamp than the wick can readily consume; for if you increase the oil you only consume the wick in less time. 'Tis true you make a brighter flame; but when the wick is done the oil will give no light.

Mr. Reed. Temperance in all things is your specific, Father Goodal.

Father Goodal. Yes; Peter says, "Add to your knowledge *temperance.*"

Mr. Williamson. I am just now informed that Miss Maria Goodal was brought up according to the rules which have been laid down, and I confess that an experiment, an example of this sort, is worth a thousand lectures. I am convinced—I will say with the poet—

"Health, O Tempearance! health is all thine own!"

EDITOR.

New York, December 4, 1833.

New York, December 4, 1833.

The Pope in an Agony.

DR. BARKER, of this city, has just handed me the following address from the Pope to the Clergy and Laity under his care. It shows how the Pontiff's heart palpitates in anticipation of the future. The prognostics of an incurable consumption are daily multiplying in his pontifical person. The nations hate the scarlet Madame; they will consume her flesh, and burn her dead body with coals of fire. Infidels are the fittest persons for this bloody work, and the Lord will most probably assign to them their own choice. When Amalek was to be destroyed, Saul was in readiness; and now the proper instruments are in waiting for the signal to take the sword. But a more fearful doom awaits the devoted city of Babylon the Great. The plagues of the Lord allotted to her are weightier far than those which fell upon the Pagan cities of the old world. Come they must—come they will—and that, too, more speedily than many suppose; for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it. *Ed. M. H.*

ALLOCUTION OF THE POPE.

The following Allocution of the Pope, fulminated against Don Pedro, is worthy of the darkest day of the dark ages. We give it precisely as we find it in Galignani's Messenger of the 22d October, with the introductory comment of that journal.

The *Courier de la Meuse,* a Catholic journal, contains the text of the Pope's allocution in the last Consistory of the Cardinals, of which the Augsburg Gazette has already spoken. Although rather long, we give this document as a curious act in the times in which we live:—

"*Venerable Brethren*—It is extremely painful and afflicting to us to have to communicate to you things full of sadness; but the grief that overwhelms us is so great that we cannot help imparting it to you, who are called upon to share the burthen of our administration, and by opening our heart to you to seek

some relief. The subject of our complaint is known, the public journals have even communicated it to the world, and all well disposed persons must have felt a sentiment of horror and indignation. You already comprehend, venerable brethren, that we are about to speak of the acts of the government established at Lisbon towards the end of the month of July, in this year, the object of which was the overthrow of all that is most sacred in the church, as well as the very serious evils with which religion is visited in that kingdom, cited, until now, as a model of devotion and of fidelity to the Catholic faith, to the Holy See, and to the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors; a kingdom which, as is meet, has always felt it an honor to obey its sovereigns, distinguished by the title of *Most Faithful Kings.*

We confess that we could not first believe what report and public rumor related upon enterprizes so audacious; but the unexpected return to Italy of him who represented us in the said kingdom as Apostolical Nuncio, and, the most positive testimony of many persons, soon convinced us that what had been previously announced to us was but too true. It is then as certain as it is greatly to be deplored, that the abovementioned government has unjustly driven away him who represented our person and the Holy See, commanding him to quit the kingdom without the least delay. But after so gross an insult offered to the Holy See and to us, the audacity of these perverse men has been carried still farther against the Catholic Church, against ecclesiastical property, against the inviolable right of the Holy See. Considering that all these measures have been exercised, almost at the accession of a new power, and in consequence of a conspiracy prepared beforehand, our mind is filled with horror, and we cannot refrain from tears. All the public prisons have been opened, and, after having let those who were detained there go forth, they have thrown into them, in their place, some of those of whom it is written, *Touch not my Anointed.* Laymen have rashly arrogated to themselves a power over sacred things; they have proclaimed a general reform of the secular clergy, and of religious orders of both sexes. Thus the privilege of ecclesiastical faith has been destroyed by law. Here nuns, there whole communities of monks have been driven from their monasteries, the novices of all the establishments have received orders to quit them, and it is enjoined that no fresh ones are to be received. All ecclesiastical patronage is to be abolished; and the government has reserved to itself alone the right of presentation to benefices and to ecclesiastical offices. A law also forbids any one to be admitted into holy orders. The diocesan ordinaries, and monks, or nuns, who do not obey the article of the new reform, which subjects convents to the jurisdiction of the said ordinaries, as well as all the ecclesiastics of the secular and regular clergy, whom their attachment to the preceding government had caused to be removed from the place of their benefices, monasteries, or hospitals, are to be publicly declared rebels and traitors, and subjected to legal punishments. It is even decreed that every convent, where they may be received, shall be suppressed, and that judicial proceedings shall be instituted against the prelates who may have received them into their churches, as being accomplices in the same crime. Is it necessary to say more?

To these acts, so odious, and so contrary to the Catholic *profession*, others are added. All the bishoprics conferred by us, according to the nomination of the government then in power, have been declared vacant, and it has been ordained that all those who have obtained any benefice, or any ecclesiastical office, in this way, are absolutely to renounce making use of any such title; they are declared deprived of all right to its charges, and if they do not obey they will be declared rebels and traitors, and treated as such. Again, to fill up the measure of insult against the church, and the authority of the Holy See, they have abolished the august tribunal of the Apostolical Nunciature, and subjected to a lay tribunal those causes on which it has hitherto pronounced. All these measures, by which, as you clearly perceive, the most sacred laws of the church have been contemned, and its divine power trodden under foot, at the same time that the rights which belong to it alone have been usurp-

ed, and the order and constitution upon which God himself hath founded it, abolished, have done an injury to the Catholic religion which it is scarcely possible to express. Nevertheless, that which principally afflicts us is, that those acts and measures have evidently for their aim to break every bond of union with that venerable chair of the blessed Peter, which Jesus Christ has made the centre of unity, and thus the society of communion being once broken, to wound the church by the most pernicious schism. In fact, how can there be unity in the body, when the members are not united to the head, and do not obey it? And how can this union and obedience be comprehended in a country where, without mentioning other things, they drive from their sees the bishops legitimately instituted by him to whom it appertains to assign pastors to all the vacant churches, because the divine right grants to him alone the primacy of jurisdiction, and the plenitude of power. But we ought not to omit to say, that these culpable acts have afflicted us so much the more, as we ought little to have expected that such conduct would have been pursued towards us, after the course we took in the political troubles of Portugal; for we have taken the utmost care, as you know, to avoid whatever might excite hatred against ourselves and against the Holy See, or give rise even to the shadow of suspicion.

On the one hand, the duties of our universal Apostolate, and the keeping of the flock which has been confided to us by the Prince of Pastors, forced us to exercise, for the spiritual welfare of religion, and according to the principal charge of our Pontificate, the sacred rights with which we are invested; and as this right and our office came to us from God, nothing could make an encroachment thereon, neither the difference of times, nor the vicissitudes of politics. Woe be to us, if misled by any motive derived from the prudence of the age, we had abandoned the cause of the church, of religion, and the salvation of souls! But, on the other hand, in the situation of Portugal, amidst those vigorous struggles for the sovereign power, we believed that we ought to do nothing that might injure the rights of any one. Thus, we took care to publish a constitution, beginning with these words, *Solicitudo Ecclesiarum;* in which, grounding ourselves upon the authority and conduct of our predecessors—marching in the traces of the ancient Sovereign Pontiffs—following also the example of him who recently preceded us, we declared, in terms express, and calculated to exclude all strange interpretation, that our intention was neither to add any thing to, nor to retrench any thing from, the rights of any one whatever; but only to do the work of Jesus Christ, as we ought at all times to do it, according to our apostolical charge.

To this end, as we could not endure, without the deepest mortification, the acts which we have mentioned, and as we justly regard them as unworthy outrages offered to us and the Apostolic See, we have hastened to inform by writing, according to custom, the Ambassadors and Ministers of foreign powers, residing near us, of the expulsion of our Nuncio from Lisbon, in order that they may make it known to their sovereigns, and that thus the truth of the facts distorted by the public papers may be fully established. But we have deferred until this day to speak to you of all these things, in order to do it solemnly in this assembly. For this reason, venerable brethren, we expressly proclaim that we absolutely reprobate all the decrees issued by the aforesaid government of Lisbon to the great detriment of the church, of its holy ministers of the ecclesiastical law, and Holy See prerogatives; we, therefore, declare them to be null and of no effect, and expressing our most serious complaints against the audacious measures we have referred to, we declare that in exercising the duties of our office and with God's help we will oppose ourselves as a wall for the house of Israel, and show ourselves in the combat at the day of the Lord, as the interests of religion and the gravity of circumstances may require. For the rest we place this cause, which is that of God himself, in the hands of the Lord.

Supported by the powerful aid of him who best loves to manifest his wisdom and his power by drawing good out of evil, rather than by not permitting any evil at all, we firmly trust that he will bring back to a better way of thinking

those whose actions cause the church to groan under the weight of such heavy evils, and that we shall thus avoid the necessity so painful to our paternal heart, of having recourse to those spiritual arms with which God has invested our apostolic ministry. Deign, O God! Father of light and mercy, to realize our hopes. And you, my venerable brethren, come with us in full confidence to the throne of grace, in order to obtain that mercy and find that grace in the favorable succor of the Lord, which we have prayed and continued to pray for without ceasing."

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

STREETSBOROUGH, O. November 16, 1833.

I ARRIVED here yesterday, from New York, having been absent 69 days, and found all well.

The reformation has gained considerably within the past year in that state. A number have come into the truth, who were driven from sectarianism by the extravagancies into which the revival-makers have run. These, however, had some hints from the brethren of the reformation. Others have run into scepticism. The brethren there, as indeed more or less every where, want courage, combination, and experience, to make them formidable. Some want zeal—some are afraid to push forward, fearing they may do wrong, or lest they may not be seconded by the brethren, inasmuch as they have to hazard all, no man promising them very much,—and some are afraid of 'preaching' on account of abuses that have so much injured the Christian cause. They are, however, improving.

We found churches doing well in Victory, Ira, and Throopsville, Cayuga county; and Butler, Wayne county. I thanked God and took courage when I saw the love, zeal, and growing intelligence in these places, and as is usual in such places, a ripening harvest and some additions.

We had a very delightful meeting near Batavia, Gennessee county, much like those in the Western Reserve, on the 2d, 3d, and 4th of this month—present speakers, Scranton, Yearnshaw, Thomas, Spoor, Wiers, Moss, Green, Howard, and myself. Three obeyed the Lord, and many more almost persuaded to be Christians. But the parting—with tears I recollect, while I write, the zeal, the ardent affection, the energy and effect with which we exhorted each other to love and bear with each other, to be long suffering and kind, while holding forth "the truth" to enlighten, warm, and quicken the world.

Last Lord's day I spoke two miles from Dunkirk, Chatauqua county—a good prospect; and in this, as in many other places, the people are anxious to hear the words of eternal life.

I find men do not in a few days grow from infancy to manhood. I think I see in all the brethren (and no doubt they see in me) some remains of our prejudices of former opinions, and a little readiness to indulge in speculations, rather than undeviatingly call upon the world to reform and obey. I find also nothing is so powerfully calculated to correct the world about faith, as to display the evidences of the gospel; and this, by the by, was the Apostles' method of preaching, which is as necessary for sectarians as sceptics.

WILLIAM HAYDEN.

☞Brother Hayden writes, that at far as he and some more of his brethren knew, there is some mistake made in the representations which relate to brother Howard, (M. H. page 472, No. 9.) We shall make some farther inquiry on the subject, and communicate the result.

From the Evangelist.

THE following Circular is from the *Christian Casket*, and written by Elder O'Kane. It will doubtless be read with great pleasure by our brethren, as a document which demonstrates with what power and glory the ancient gospel acts in many places into which it finds its way:—

Very dear Brethren—The subject to which I am instructed to call your attention in this historical address, is the success which has attended the preaching of the ancient gospel, during the last year, in the district of country where I have labored as an Evangelist. This cannot fail to be pleasing to every saint. Although I am the only person who has acted as an Evangelist in said district, yet there are several able and successful proclaimers of the ancient gospel within the limits of my labors, whose skill in handling the word of God, far, very far, surpasses my own.

I commenced travelling as an Evangelist about the middle of last November. Since that time I have witnessed the good confession of upwards of three hundred, who are now, so far as they have come under my notice since their obedience to the gospel, walking in the truth. Many of this number were formerly respectable members of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches.

Those who have proclaimed the gospel have introduced a number into the kingdom of Jesus, which would probably swell the whole number to about six hundred in the district of country where I have labored as an Evangelist. The most signal success has been confined to the following places, viz.—

At *Columbia*, on the west fork of White Water, six miles below Connersville. In this place upwards of forty have been immersed for remission of their sins.

In *Connersville* a church has been organized, whose number is now about thirty. Several have been immersed in this place.

Danville. At this place a number have been immersed for remission.

Hannah's Creek. At this place there is a brilliant prospect of future success. Our congregations are large, respectable, attentive, and feeling. Many of them hearing, believed, and were immersed. The church has not yet broken all the fetters of the *old regular system;* but is progressing rapidly in the knowledge of the gospel.

Oxford, Ohio. There is a small church about two miles from this place, which has increased somewhat during the summer. I have immersed six in this town for remission.

Little Flat Rock, Rush county. Here the victory is gained on the side of Reformation. The *old regulars* are on the decline; yet their opposition to the truth is very bitter. But the congregation of disciples has increased largely notwithstanding; and there is at this time a swelling prospect of success to the ancient gospel. A large number has been immersed during the last year, in the bounds of this congregation, and a much larger number added to the church. The brethren meet every Lord's day to commemorate the dying love of our glorious Redeemer.

Greensburg. Here the ancient gospel was first proclaimed by J. P. Thompson and myself, about one year ago. Since that time a church has been organized, consisting of about thirty-three members. Many of them were immersed for the remission of their sins.

Ben Davis' Creek. Here the proclamation of the ancient gospel has been attended with success. Since last Spring a number have been immersed for remission. The old Regulars evince the strongest opposition to the truth in this place. But the victory is gained on the side of Reformation, blessed be the name of the Lord!

Indianapolis. In this place, since last Spring, nineteen have been immersed for remission of their sins. A church has been constituted, which consists of about forty members. Several of the most respectable citizens about this place are members of the church. Our congregations have been very large and attentive. The citizens of the town who profess no religion, evince more of the meek temper of the gospel towards the brethren, than many who are members of the popular sects. There is a fixed determination in the bosom of

the many influential among the sects, to oppose what Paul would call the *simple gospel* of Christ, and I fear that this opposition proceeds more from interest than any thing else. But from the general and solemn attention which the citizens of this place have given to the proclamation of the ancient gospel, we may safely conclude that a large number of them will, ere long, yield submission to the authority of King Messiah. May the good Lord prostrate every opposing effort, and bring the people to a speedy reformation!

Conclusion of Vol. IV.

AS the *Patrick Henry*, in which I now descend the James River, moves onwards and downwards towards the world of waters; so down the stream of time, and onward to the boundless ocean of eternity, we move along. The variegated landscapes along the banks of this placid stream, picture to the reflecting mind the ever-shifting scenery of human life. Here the eye is occasionally feasted with the delicate beauties, with the fine touches of the hand of Nature; there Nature and Art combine their powers to minister delight. But again, Nature presents herself in the most capricious attitudes—wild, rude, and fantastic: anon, she assumes a dull and uninteresting uniformity. As if tired with this, she suddenly attempts every thing at once; and as the sinuosity of the stream on which we sail, turns our face to every point of the compass, so she exhibits herself—pleased with nothing long.

Our fellow-passengers are variously employed. Some are full of admiration, and are attentive to all that passes on the voyage. Others seem to observe nothing; while here on my right, two are fast asleep Another party are engaged in debate on the affairs of state. Some are reading the news of the day, while a few are trying their skill a game of chance. Two or three seem not to know what to do with themselves, and are only concerned to know how soon they will get to port. One gentleman, just at my left, has opened a New Testament, which he carries in his pocket, and is now reading with apparent attention the sayings of the Apostles. Another, a short distance from him, is intensely absorbed in mercantile calculations. Meanwhile the boat carries us from fifteen to twenty miles an hour; and although she jars exceedingly, I have concluded to place myself at table, and sketch a few reflections for the close of the present volume.

On taking a retrospect of my own life, I discover that since I appeared on the stage of action—since I was, according to law, of mature age and reason, I have been devoted to religion. For twenty-three years I have been pleading the cause of the Bible. It won the admiration of my heart years before I ventured to speak a word in its praise. My first public speech was a eulogy on the many excellencies of the Volume of Life. As my taste for reading increased, my thirst for other religious books abated. Soon I learned that while other authors speak about religion, and address themselves sometimes to the passions, sometimes to the prejudices, sometimes to the intellect of men—the Bible always speaks religion to the heart, by addressing the whole man.

But in attempting to distinguish what true religion was, by taking lessons only from the Counsellors of Heaven, I soon found that we had many counterfeits in current circulation, and set myself to ascertain the infallible characteristics of that which is celestial and divine. As my mind acquired confidence in these, I proceeded to suggest them to the consideration of my contemporaries. But not till about *sixteen years ago*, did I presume to commit any thing to the press; and then, perhaps, I was rather premature. However, such was the certainty of my conclusions, that *eleven years ago*, I decided to make an effort in the form of a monthly periodical, to rouse the slumbering virgins to listen to the Master's voice. We succeeded in waking but a few, who seemed desirous to know what the Bridegroom had spoken. So happy were we in gaining a correct view of the actual state of things, that we were able, in the first numbers of the *Christian Baptist*, to sketch the whole outlines of the course, which, with untiring steadfastness, we have since pursued. Though almost alone at first, we soon found some bold and dauntless coadjutors, who greatly encouraged our efforts, strengthened our hands, and aided our endeavors. As we progressed our vision was greatly strengthened; and objects, which at first appeared rather dim in the murky atmosphere of smoky Babylon, soon brightened in our view, and stood in bold relief in the increasing effulgence of gospel light.

We found in the ruins of the many-tongued city, a Chart which guided us safely to Jerusalem; and in the Holy City we found the ancient and venerable institution of Jesus Christ, in all its original simplicity and beauty. Many who had long waited in prayerful expectation for a better and a brighter day, now saw the morning star arise, and joined the standard of the restoration. We strengthened each other's hands, and began to rebuild the ruined places. Soon as our neighbors saw the trowel in our hands, they began to mock our feeble efforts, and disdainfully said, "If but a fox ascend the repaired breaches, the wall will fall down again." They insulted our efforts, and soon began to throw stones at us. We had to arm ourselves with the sword of the Spirit; and while with one hand we laid up the stones, with the other we grasped the two-edged sword.

In this way the work was much impeded; and while our enemies prevented our efforts, they would occasionally deride our slow progress. But the Lord was with us and increased the numbers of helpers in the good work, and now it goes on more prosperously. On the map of Christendom we saw not one green spot when first we blew the trumpet of restoration. Many individuals here and there trusted in God, and prayed for times of refreshing. Many mourned for the waste places; many remonstrated with their contemporaries for departing from the orders of the King, and some extolled the laws and institutions of the great Lawgiver; but their opponents had drawn them into the labyrinths and ambuscades of their own speculations; and one community, with the original gospel and the original institutions no where reared its head over the desolations of Zion. But the Lord be praised, many of these children of oppression joined hands, and by a united and vigorous effort raised the tabernacle of Israel.

To lay aside the figurative and to come to the literal: The good work of reformation still advances with rapid strides. Much has been done in some places; but more is yet needed to be done in all places. Many myriads have been congregated under the banners of restoration, and many more are annually enlisting under the standard of the Cross. But the oldest soldiers are not yet perfect masters of the heavenly tactics of the holy war, and the young recruits have almost every thing to learn. Our brethren will not consent, and we have not our own consent, that we lessen the labors of the press. We much desire a breathing time, and a short respite from the toils of this long campaign; but we dare not lay down the weapons by which we have so long, and, I trust, in some good degree, successfully waged war against the rulers of the darkness of this world—against the errors and delusions which have desolated the vineyard of the Lord.

We know we have many very able brethren, who now greatly and valiantly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; and other presses besides our own are battering down the ramparts of the man of sin. But we must not dismount our cannon nor unbuckle our panoply, till we see less need for our assistance in the army of the faith.

This reformation has been hitherto successful by the press, and by the tongues of those who stand before the people; but its chief and main support is the behaviour of those in the ranks. Nothing can be a substitute for this; for both the pen of the writer and the tongue of the orator can be better dispensed with, than the religious and exemplary lives of its private and public advocates.

The press, however, has been the first and principal means of the circulation and spread of the truth; and the exertions now making to prevent the reading of this periodical, show how potent it is imagined to be by our opponents. Never was more systematic and untiring efforts used in these Republics, to prevent the reading of any book, than are now in requisition against this humble *Harbinger* of better times. Our opponents say, (and they are good judges in this case,) that this work cannot be read by any person without catching the spirit of reform. And, indeed, we may confirm their fears by assuring them that we scarcely know of a single case in which this work has been attentively read by any inquisitive mind, in which it has failed to effect a moral revolution. The truth is very plain; and when divested of the entanglements of religious sophists, it strikes the mind with an impetus which shows from what quarter it comes.

But the friends of reformation, we hardly think, are quite as active in extending the influence of our labors, as our opponents are in opposing the circulation of this periodical. They say twice, "Dont read the Harbinger," for once our friends dare say, "Read and judge for yourselves." Such appears to be the fact in the regions through which we have recently passed, and are still passing. And from what we have now learned from an actual survey of this state of Virginia, we are fully sustained in saying, that in the exact ratio of the reading of this paper, is the progress of reform in this commonwealth.

Our object being to disabuse the public mind of human dogmas, and to call the attention of men to the Living Oracles, when this is done, we have no more to do; for the Bible must guide the understanding and authorize the sentiments and practices of all the disciples of the great Teacher. But to get the people to do this, some means must be used to fix their attention and to allure their minds to the reading of the divine communications. From all that is before us, we must say, and we feel in duty bound to say it, that if the readers of the Harbinger were doubled, the progress of reformation, if not doubled, would, in the vicinities where read, and amongst the reading community, be very much increased.

No false modesty or morbid delicacy should, we think, prevent the avowal of a conviction of so much importance to the friends of reform. I will add, that it is not supposed that the essays from the pen of the Editor is the sole means of this usefulness. The contributions of our numerous correspondents, and the notices of many of our brethren, are, in our opinion, as efficient instruments in forwarding the good work as any thing we now say on those matters which are already so fully expressed. Nor is any thing above said intended to detract in the least from the indispensable necessity and great utility of the constant labors of the proclaimers of the word, without which all other means would, in the work of reformation, be comparatively unavailing.

As an apology for the egotistic character of this article, we shall hear a few words from the *Genius of Temperance:*—"Every one who ventures to differ from the multitude, or stem the popular current, is accused of egotism. To venture an opinion *alone*, is thought to be an intolerable arrogation of exclusive wisdom. Fulton was ridiculed as an egotist, with how much justice no one need now inquire.—Success wipes off the odium. But no man ever contended for a valuable improvement, or a necessary reform, without being branded as an egotist."

We can succeed only by getting the people to think for themselves; our enemies succeed by persuading the people to let them think for them. All we aim at in these concluding remarks, is, to excite our brethren to take into their most mature consideration, whether any thing more can be done than is now doing to forward the cause of reform, and to remind them that as one of those means, we think a more enlarged circulation of this work would contribute to the furtherance of reformation.

For their exertions in this work, and their continued support of all the means now in use, the Lord has amply rewarded them by the success which he has vouchsafed to their endeavors. Let us, then, be still more enterprizing, industrious, and persevering, and let every new triumph over bigotry, intolerance, and superstition, stimulate us to increased effort in the great work of regenerating the world. And to him who has made the seed sown multiply and increase, be all the honor and praise! EDITOR.

James River, November 16, 1833.

INDEX TO VOL. IV.

A

	Page
A. B. G. to Philalethes,	11
Do. do.	251
Ability and Inability,	542
Address to the Saints of the Most High God, especially the Baptists,	590
Adams John,	523
Anecdotes Religious of dying Professors,	426
Analogy between the Jewish and Gentile Church,	99
Assistance Divine,	281

B

Baptists Virginia, Address to the, Part II.	83
Do. do. do. Part III.	110
Do. United, an Address to the,	509
Baptist, the Confession of a Regular,	588
Baptism for Obedience,	517
Do. for Renunciation,	518
Beattie's Dr. Opinion of Doctor Campbell's Translation, in letters to Sir W. Forbes,	22
To Mrs. Montague,	24
To Sir W. Forbes,	24
Believer's Creed,	426
Believer's Baptism and Infant Sprinkling, contrasted,	547
Biblical Criticism—No. 1,	6
Do. Do. No. 2,	7
Bible, Falsification of the,	283
Bone of Contention,	233
Broaddus Mr.	8
Broaddus' Mr. Form of Church Covenant,	180
Burnet D. S. Letter from,	590

C

Catholic Controversy,	478
Catacombs,	480
Catholic Controversy—No. 1,	538
Calvin on Baptism,	543
Calumny, Methodistic,	300
Charles Cassedy, Esq. Letter from,	35
Reply—No. 1,	72
Do. No. 2,	122
Do. No. 3,	174
Charles Cassedy, Esq. Letter from, No. 2,	294
Reply—No. 4,	193
Charles Cassedy, Esq. letter from, No. 3,	464
Reply—No. 5,	467
Christian College,	189
Christian College,	240
Church of God,	114
Cleland Dr. No. 7, Remarks on, No. 3,	32
Cleland and Jennings Messrs.	75
Cleland Dr. and the New Version, No. 1,	402
Do. do. do.—No. 2,	460
Do. do. do.—No. 3,	500
Do. do. do.—No. 4,	529
Conscience, No. 1,	565
Conclusion of vol. IV.	618

D

Death and Testimony of Spencer Clack,	427
Declension awful in the Virginia Regular Baptis	230
Disappointments,	192
Doctorates,	48

E

Ecclesiastical Tyranny,	163
Elder's Office,	244
Emperor first Christian, a persecutor,	499
Epaphras—No. 6,	79
Reply,	127
Epaphras—No. 7,	170
Reply,	171
Epaphras—No. 8,	218
Epaphras—No. 9,	412
Reply,	413
Equality,	576
Everlasting Gospel—No. 1,	70
Do. do. No. 2,	119
Do. do. No. 3,	224
Do. do. No. 4,	318
Evidence Personal,	161

F

Faith, Confidence,	42
Fasting—No. 1,	568
Fasting—No. 2,	602
Faithful, a hint to the,	520
Fowler's Mr.—Conversation at,	534
Do. do.	577
Do. do.	608

G

Goodal's Mr.—New Year's evening at, 43
Do. do. do. 64
Do. do. No. 3, 166
Do. do. No. 4, 220
Do. do. Conversation at, No. 5, 310
Do. do. No. 6, 415
Do. do. (continued,) 512
Grew Henry, letter from—Part 1, 304
Do. do. Part 2, 395

H

Henley's T. M. Address, 13
Hebrew Letter, 21
Hereditary Total Depravity, 239
Human Bones for Manure, and the End of Human Glory, 479

I

Inquirer's Explanation, 29
Infidel's Creed, 425

J

Jennings & Cleland's New Discovery, 77
Jews, 191
Jews, 480
Jerusalem, a voice from, 19
John to Philalethes, 131

L

Letters of Recommendation, 239
Liberality Sectarian, 471
Liberality Methodistic, 470
Luke xvi. 18. 230

M

Mason's Sir John Views of the World, 69
M'Corkle S. M. Signs of the Times by, 49
M'Corkle's S. M. Views of the Bible, 50
Do. do. of Church Corruption, 53
Do. Divisions of Christianity, 56
Do. Signs of the Times, No. 2, 97
No. 3, 146
Do. Signs of the Times, No. 4, 212
No. 5, 268
No. 6, 289
No. 7, 385
No. 8, 433
No. 9, 481
No. 10, 554
Mother Church, 589
M'Ilvaine's Bishop Opinion of the Reformation, 229

N

Notice and Apology, 144

O

Obituary Notice, 336
Omen, a good, the Pope affrighted, 68
Ordinance Dover, 10

P

Philalethes to A. B. G. 142
Phenomenon, 572
Pope in an agony, 613
Prophecies, 12
Do. 49
Proscription more at Fredericksburg, Va. 113
Prayer and Special Influence, 187
Do. do. 230
Providence Special, 241
Presbyterian Philadelphia, 226

Q

Query on being born of the Spirit, 12
Queries, 95
Querists, to, 96
Query, an important, answered, 197

R

Religious Inconsistency, 47
Reform, Progress of, 86, 135, 192 234, 286, 324, 429, 471, 524 574, 616.
Reformation, history of, 94
Reformation exalts and dignifies human nature, 262
Reasons, two, for reading the Harbinger, 146
Richmond, Christianity in, 569
Roman Catholic and Protestant Controversy, 288
Rocks of Lake Superior, 528

S

Scott Sir Walter, 26
Scepticism Latent, 603
Semple's History of the Baptists, Notes on reading, 116
Sherlock on Divine Providence, 205 247, 296, 389, 435
Stuart Professor, on the Mode of Baptism, No. 1, 278
Do. do. do. No. 2, 321
Do. do. do. No. 3, 421
Do. do. do. No. 4, 445
Do. do. do. No. 5, 496
Do. do. do. No. 6, 531
Stone Barton W. letter to, 421
Letter to, by T. Campbell, Sen. 439
Do. do. 503
Do. do. 548
Do. do. 594
Superstition Catholic, 605

T

Testimony of an Individual in favor of the Ancient Gospel, 133
Theological School, Beggars for, 288
Theological Schools, Query on, 586
Reply, 587
Trinitarianism, Arminianism, Socinianism, 153
Translation, New, 522
Tour to New York, via Eastern Virginia, Notes on a, No. 1, 560
No. 2, 583
No, 3, 598

V

Virginia Doings, 315

W

Warfare, new mode of, 106
Waterman Mr. J. A. on Special Providence & Spiritual Agency, 242
Reply to, 243
Waterman J. A. on Converting Power, 330
Reply to, 333
Reply continued, 408
" " on Converting Power, 448
Reply to, 454
" " on Converting Power, 487
Reply to, 492
" " Essay on Particular Providence, 274
Where is there a primitive church? 201
What the Church ought to do, 502
Wind and Spirit, 24
Wilson Rev. Dr. Joshua L. to the, 203
Worcester on the Atonement, 256
World, the, a bundle of contradictions, 47

☞As we had only a small space for the progress of reform, we thought it well, in addition to brother Hayden's letter, to give another, extracted from the Evangelist, and somewhat curtailed; both which will serve as an epitome of the state of things in the reformation, which we learn from the numerous documents received, but necessarily withheld on account of the pressure of interesting and valuable matter. *Publisher.*

ERRATUM.

Page 586, in the letter dated at brother Townes', for 'November 6,' read November 8*th*

INTRODUCTION.

The reader's attention is invited to a few remarks upon the subject of the subjoined address.

On the 19th of October last, the Religious Herald published a report from the Dover association, whereby it appears that six individuals named, had been lopped from their body, and thus held up to public odium. The writer being among that number, and thinking himself unkindly treated, nay, much injured, solicited, through the agency of a friend, a place in the vehicle of this detraction, that he might the more fully meet, and if practicable, recover himself from what he considered the unmerited effects of the censure of that body. He expected to take up about ten or twelve pages of manuscript, which he desired his friend to make known to the editor. Upon reflection, however, the editor thought it best to decline this simple act of justice to a man, whose good name, if he possessed one, he had most faithfully aided in filching from him. He was requested to insert then, the very short address of the Lower College church; which was likewise refused. Perhaps editor Ball was not present; be that as it may, the Religious Herald circulated what the writer considers, and thinks he has proved to be *slanders, and refused to publish their refutations:* which induced the writer to adopt the present method of reply.

That the public may the more correctly judge between us, the unbroken *report* and *resolution* of the association, are submitted upon the following pages. The address of the Lower College church is likewise added.

In composing his address, chiefly in the plural number, the writer very generally limits his remarks to himself, but occasionally holds allusion to the brethren cut off with him. Should he have thrown out any thing, having such bearing, contrary to facts, or their wishes, it has been foreign to his design, and remains open to correction. His intention is to throw no responsibility upon any of them, by the exhibition of his own views, as presented in this address.

JOHN DU-VAL.

King & Queen County, February, 1838.

DOVER DECREE.

The select committee appointed to consider and report "what ought to be done in reference to the new doctrines and practices which have disturbed the peace and harmony of some of the churches composing this association," met at the house of elder Miles Turpin, and having invited and obtained the aid and counsel of elders Andrew Broaddus, Eli Ball, John Micou, William Hill, Miles Turpin, and brother Erastus T. Montague, after due deliberation, respectfully report the following preamble and resolution, for the consideration and adoption of the association:—

This association having been, from its origin, blessed with uninterrupted harmony, and a high degree of religious prosperity, has seen with unspeakable regret, within a few years past, the spirit of speculation, controversy and strife, growing up among some of the ministers and churches within its bounds. This unhappy state of things has evidently been produced by the preaching and writings of Alexander Campbell, and his adherents. After having deliberately and prayerfully examined the doctrines held and propagated by them, and waited long to witness their practical influence upon the churches, and upon society in general, we are thoroughly convinced that they are doctrines, not according to godliness, but subversive of the true spirit of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; disorganizing and demoralizing in their tendency; and therefore, ought to be disavowed and resisted, by all the lovers of truth and sound piety.

Digitized by Google

It is needless to specify and refute the errors held and taught by them; this has been often done, and as often have the doctrines quoted from their writings been denied, with the declaration, that they are misrepresented or misunderstood. If, after more than seven years investigation, the most pious and intelligent men in the land are unable to understand what they speak and write, it surely is an evidence of some radical defect in the things taught, or in the mode of teaching them. Their views of sin, faith, repentance, regeneration, baptism, the agency of the Holy Spirit, church government, the christian ministry, and the whole scheme of christian benevolence, are, we believe, contrary to the plain letter and spirit of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour.

By their practical influence, churches long blessed with peace and prosperity, have been thrown into wrangling and discord—principles long held sacred by the best and most enlightened men that ever lived or died, are vilified and ridiculed, as "school divinity," "sectarian dogmas," &c. Ministers who have counted all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, are reprobated and denounced, as "visionary dreamers," "mystifiers," "blind leaders of the blind," "hireling priests," &c. &c. The church in which many of them live, and from which they call it persecution to be separated, is held up to public scorn, as "Babylon the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth." The most opprobrious epithets are unsparingly applied to principles and practices, which, we think, are clearly taught in the word of God, and which we hold dear to our hearts. While they arrogate to themselves the title of "reformers," it is lamentably evident, that no sect in Christendom needs reformation more than they do.

While they boast of superior light and knowledge, we can but lament, in their life and conversation, the absence of that wisdom "that is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." In fine, the writings of Alexander Campbell, and the spirit and manner of those who profess to admire his writings and sentiments, appear to us remarkably destitute of "the mind that was in Christ Jesus:" of that divine love "which suffereth long and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil." Wherever these writings and sentiments have, to any extent, been introduced into our churches, the spirit of hypercriticism, "vain janglings and strife about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers," have chilled the spirit of true devotion, and put an end to christian benevolence and harmony.

If the opprobrious epithets and bitter denunciations, so liberally heaped upon us, by Mr. Campbell and his followers, are deserved, they, as pious and honorable men, cannot desire to live in communion with us; and if they are undeserved, and designedly slanderous, this, of itself, would forbid our holding them in christian fellowship. If, indeed, they have found the long lost key of knowledge, and are the only persons, since the days of the apostles, who have entered and explored the Divine Arcanum, it is due to themselves—to pur-blind Christendom—to the world—to truth—to God, that they should, in obedience to the divine command, clothed in the shining garments of truth and righteousness, walk out of 'Babylon,' and concentrating their light, exhibit a true sample of the "ancient order of things:" and diffuse around them a blaze of "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Until they do this, grave and thinking men will doubt their high pretensions, for "by their fruits you shall know them." It would seem that conscientious, unobtrusive, holy men, whose hearts are sickened with the depravity of the times, and who mourn a sad and general departure from truth and holiness, would voluntarily come out from "the present corrupt order of things," and holding sweet communion with one another, and with their God, let their light so shine, that others, seeing their good works, might be induced to glorify their father in Heaven; but alas! they appear to be a strange, *anti-sectarian, dogmatical sect*, who live only in the fire of strife and controversy, and who seek to remain in connection with the existing churches, that they may with the greater facility obtain materials for feeding the disastrous flame.

In every aspect of the case then, a separation is indispensably necessary. The cause of truth and righteousness requires it—the best interests of all the parties concerned, demand it.

We, therefore, the assembled ministers and delegates of the Dover association, after much prayerful deliberation, do hereby affectionately recommend to the

Digitized by Google

churches in our connection, to separate from their communion, all such persons as are promoting controversy and discord, under the specious name of "reformers." That the line of distinction may be clearly drawn, so that all who are concerned may understand it, we feel it our duty to declare, that, whereas Peter Ainsley, John Du-Val, Matthew W. Webber, Thos. M. Henley,* John Richards, and Dudley Atkinson, ministers within the bounds of this association, have voluntarily assumed the name of "reformers," in its party application, by attending a meeting publicly advertised for that party; and by communing with, and otherwise promoting the views of the members of that party, who have been separated from the fellowship and communion of regular Baptist churches—

Resolved, That this association cannot consistently and conscientiously receive them, nor any other ministers maintaining their views, as members of their body: nor can they in future act in concert with delegates from any church or churches, that may encourage, or countenance their ministrations.

"Persecution often defeats its own cause. Men cannot be restrained from thinking; and they will think that a bad cause which requires force to support it."

Bishop Semple's Hist. of Virga. Baptists, p. 180.

To the late Delegates of the Dover Association:

BRETHREN—In the course of the proceedings of your last meeting, you have been pleased to hold up to the contempt of the public, and censure of your respective congregations, six individuals named in your report, touching the reformation now progressing in our country, and particularly in the baptist denomination. Considering ourselves to be aggrieved by your course, and believing that you have been *misled* either by your own prejudice or the prejudice of some of your more conspicuous members, we ask your attentive and christian reading of the subjoined remarks:

We hope that you will bear with us brethren in taking the liberty to think, to say, and undertake to prove to every dispassionate mind, that your course is no more nor less than *persecution* "*for conscience sake.*" We know that in no ears can these terms impart a more grating and painful sensation than in those of our baptist brethren. Yes! they look back to the days of their fathers, when the "glad tidings" were borne among the people of this very land at the risk of name, goods, liberty and life! They turn their eyes to the labours of a WEBBER, a Lewis, a Courtney, a Ford, a Waller, a Greenwood, a Lunsford, and the little company that struggled with them; and drop the sympathetic tear over *their sufferings*, and the *depravity* of the human heart, that could dictate and execute such deeds. But notwithstanding your emotions and heart-felt objections to an application of the terms, it is still correct; *persecution* is the same in nature in every age, from every source: being naturally manifested first by words, and secondly by deeds. By the first step to take away one's good name, so as to render him odious and useless, and by the second, if the first is not successful, to arrest him personally, spoil him of his goods, and if need be, of liberty and life! This is the general course of what is called *religious* persecution; and strange it is that our brethren have not remarked it. All persecutions, as far as we have observed their history, have been mainly predicated upon *misrepresentation*, and that very frequently wilful, and highly aggravated; this is their *sting*; deprive them of this, and they become the pleaders of that which they would oppose; making the world an enlightened judge of the merits and defects of the ground of controversy.

There appears to us to be no difference on the ground of persecution, as manifested by Leo X. against Luther and others, the persecutors of the baptists of the last century, and the present leaders of your body. All pretended to think, or really thought, that they were defending or protecting "the faith once delivered to the saints," while it devolved upon others to detect and expose their true motives. *Ambition*, *pride*, and *self*, have been found very generally to share largely in the honours of private counsellors in cases of this kind. The principle of action being the same, and the motives analagous, there is but one reason which prevents the end from

* It appears upon information, that T. M. Henley, (above named,) has not been considered, for some time past, as in our connexion.

Digitized by Google

being always sadly tragical, and that is, the *means* of accomplishing the end are frequently very diverse, and beyond *religious* or rather *irreligious* control; consequently, will suffer the spirit of persecution to produce only correspondent results. *The laws of the land*, and *public sentiment*, under a kind providence, are here, at this time, our only efficient protectors. In the time of George III. public sentiment was made to overleap the limits of the act of toleration by the undue influence of the clergy, and corporal punishment by blows and imprisonment, was freely dispensed to our brethren. By an influence very near a-kin to that, it is now designed to lead you to make a similar experiment upon the public for the accomplishment of the destruction of religious liberty; but we humbly trust that the tree of civil liberty is yet too green, too deeply rooted, and stands too nearly connected with religious liberty, to yield to this attempt. But more of this again. The following seems to be a fair conclusion: if our brethren are right in persecuting their fellow christians at all, it must be upon the ground of propriety, *scriptural propriety*, which reason can never cease to exist while the end remains unaccomplished. If then neither stating our views *fairly*, which we are able to say we have never seen done in one case; *misrepresenting them grossly*, intentionally or unintentionally, God knows, we do not; nor lopping us from the body, the professed body of Christ, will enable them to accomplish a lawful design, then surely they would not err by adding other "pains and penalties." Persecution is not limited to banishment, starvation, imprisonment, hanging, loss of goods and burning, but embraces all unauthorized attempts to deprive men of their proper rights, whether as these rights stand connected with estate, body, or soul. "Christ never used any thing that looked like force or violence except once, and that was to drive bad men out of the temple, and not to drive them in." All divine authority, *consistently* good men, and reason itself, stand arrayed against you. The *conscience* is constituted the domestic monitor of man as a moral agent; and men are considered honest, (light considered,) or the reverse, in proportion to the accordance or discordance of their words and actions, with the suggestions of this monitor, so that if *it* condemn them, God declares that he will do likewise. Viewing things thus, we have been reduced to a dilemma. The discharge of what seemed to us to be our duty to God and our fellow-creatures, would unavoidably lead to practices and results, which were more or less calculated to disturb the present peace and happiness of many of our brethren, who seem to think that a large addition of years is proof conclusive that they cannot be the subjects of religious error. In fact our course has been calculated to mortify all the "high minded" who will not "fear," and all who have outgrown the child-like temper, and *will not learn*. Under such circumstances what should have been done by us? We were not our own, but had been bought with a price; our responsibility was of no trifling character. But some have said without hesitation that we should have withdrawn from our connection with your body. But have such ever presented a better argument than force to us? We believe that most of those who have proposed this course meant to refuse to us the rights of christians, as experience in several cases proves. But if peradventure we had found the "long lost key of knowledge," which had been taken away by the *lawyers*, by whose "*traditions*," says Dr. A. Clarke, a wrong meaning had been given to those scriptures which speak of the kingdom of the Messiah, thereby *hindering*, [mark it reader!] *the people* from entering into it, was it not our duty to begin our work of love first in our mother churches? in whose welfare we must needs feel the greatest interest. We could not withdraw without a sense of duty. If our obligations then required us to stay as long as practicable to avoid your censure, we had to play the *hypocrite* by *disguising the truth;* not *speak at all;* which would have proved us bad men in several respects; or lastly, we were forced to incur your displeasure as honest men and public speakers, by declaring what we believed to be truth, leaving all consequences to Him who is above all! to whom be glory forever! You see then brethren how we have been straitened between God and men, and how we could have enjoyed "the pleasures of sin for a season," had we not rather chosen to suffer affliction under present circumstances. And you need not now to be reminded how cheerfully and affectionately you would have retained us under the specious garb of hypocrisy, as long as we would have said "Shibboleth" to please you, while as candid men, (pardon the expression,) you have cast us off as being unworthy of the exalted relation which had long subsisted between us.

There is so striking an analogy between the persecutors of the last century and yourselves, we must beg leave to surprise you with a hint at the likeness of your

Digitized by Google

respective attitudes. As to the labours of Lunsford in the Northern Neck in '74, bishop Semple says, "his preaching made a great noise, not only for its ingenuity, but for its novelty. Here, as in most other places, where the baptists preached, they cried out that ☞ *some new doctrine was started, that the church was in danger.* Mr. L. was accounted worthy to share a part of this opposition." During the heat of that persecution, at one of Mr. L's meetings, after some skirmishes, actual fighting between the friends of the parties, the same historian says, "Mr. Lunsford retired to a house, the persecutors pursued him, he shut himself up, and they were not hardy enough to break in to him. One of them desired to have the privilege of conversing with Mr. L. with a view of convincing him. He was let in and did converse. When he came out he wore a new face; his party asked him the result. 'You had better converse with him yourselves,' said he." This brethren, might have been a man of the world, at least such a one as you and we have been taught to consider far from *pious*, but be that as it may, we must admit that the most happy effects resulted from a personal interview. Would it not have been better for you to have done likewise before you went *all lengths?* We have seldom conversed privately with any of our brethren of the opposition, who did not seem to be more or less disappointed in our favour, judging from their admissions and concessions. When one of us made a public defence of doctrinal views at Bruington, on the 5th March, '31, elder A. Broaddus remarked to him privately that there was but little difference, (or in other words, to that effect,) between *them*, but that it was "Campbell" with whom he differed. Why then should the elder cut him off? But again: has the same gentlemen not admitted substantially as much to, and in favour of another of us? Did not elder Jeter admit in the committee of the association, that his observation of the course of one of us in recent labours in the Northern Neck, enabled him to say that those labours were calculated to do good. Then surely, neither "demoralizing" nor "disorganizing;" let these things be fairly weighed. One of us had also the pleasure of a very interesting conversation not many months ago, in the presence of several friends, with elder Claybrook, a man of high standing among us, both in a religious and civil point of view, who admitted that their difference consisted rather in words than substance. Did he after this venture to vote a *schism* in the body of Christ, by aiding in lopping that individual and others from that body? What though he be the most "*uncomely*" and unworthy of Christ's members? Elder Claybrook's parting words to him on the occasion alluded to, were, that he would not give him up. Should he have conspired in this act, has he not sinned against knowledge, against his own declaration, and against the immutable law of God? If he has done this thing we can sympathise with him, still love him, and hope that God will blot it from his remembrance. It is an awful act, while *to* this member, and *of* him, he has admitted his pretensions to the religion of Jesus, he has with your body declared him to be a disorganizer and demoralizer, without evidence; nay, contrary to his own personal observation of his course. In conclusion upon this point, we would ask in the name of common sense, but more particularly in the name of the holy, meek and gentle religion of Jesus, what can your course be other than the most unrighteous persecution for "conscience sake?"

But you have not only involved yourselves in the very serious predicament of persecutors, you have likewise by your course produced an actual *schism* in the body of Christ, infringed a prerogative of the constituent members of the association, violated the constitution of that body by attempting to exercise a domination over the consciences of free men, contrary to their natural, civil, and religious rights; held up to public odium and abhorrence without any specific charge of immorality, the character of individuals; and lastly, distinctly violated the express directions of the Saviour, as presented in the New Testament.

1. Circumstances seemed to us to justify a *division* of the Dover association about this time, and we had but little doubt that a division would sooner or later happen: a *division*, not a *schism*. Circumstances point out when divisions of christian bodies may prudently be made, but no circumstances can ever justify a *schism*. As long as a professor of the christian religion believes what God has had written for his instruction, and obeys what he has commanded, he should be classed among those whom God approves, who "have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." The third epistle of John, presents upon this subject the most valuable instruction. There we find the character of an individual ambitious, high minded, dictatorial and persecuting, whose course was *schismatic* and sinful. Do you not perceive *some* analogy, not to say much, between some of

Digitized by Google

the conspicuous members of your body and Diotrephes—his course and theirs? This breaking the bonds among, and impairing the rights of Christ's members by unlawful means, is what we understand to be *schismatic* and sinful. How necessary it is for us often to look attentively into the gospel glass! So prone are we to forget what manner of men we are. You have divided the body, and will degrade if you can.

2. You have infringed a prerogative of the churches of which the association is composed. Surely, it will not be contended that the association has a right to enter into the bosom of one of her families, and with violent hands, seize and drag out before the public one of their members, without even the formality of a warning, or any specified charge of immorality. The association, finding what she deems a disorderly member in any congregation, should invoke the attention of such congregation to the case. Should the congregation fail to enforce the *word of God*, (not the inferences or misrepresentations of men,) then would the association be at liberty to drop or continue her connection with such congregation. Associations, being constituted of congregations, as such, and not of individuals, as such, can only properly conduct themselves accordingly. Your infringement of this right of the churches, speaks in terms not to be mistaken.

3. But we conceive that you have distinctly violated your own constitution; departed from the usage of such bodies; and design farther, to infringe the rights of our countrymen, by imposing a conditional penalty upon them in the exercise of their most legitimate rights.

It will be expected of us to produce good witnesses for what we say, or at least good reasons. We shall, then, simply introduce to your notice upon the first item, the testimony of bishop Semple, p. 41, of his history.

"An association," says the writer, "is a council or assembly, composed of delegates or representatives from each church, within the bounds designated for that purpose. The object of which, is, to take into consideration the welfare of the churches, and to assist them by their *counsel*, in the preservation of order and discipline among themselves."—"The Baptist churches are *independent*, and consequently, the business of an association *is not authoritative. They may advise, and indeed, urge their advice, but cannot compel.*"

The discrepancies of your course, and what bishop Semple here says of your rights, are too glaring to need exposure. You have not proved us immoral in deportment; convicted us of error in doctrine; advised the churches to which we respectively belong; nor taken any but the most *dictatorial* steps throughout the the whole proceedings—entering by your mandate into "*independent*" churches, selecting and exposing individual members in the most extraordinary manner.

As to the difference between your course and the usage of such bodies, we would call your attention to the comparatively great moderation and christian forbearance of the Goshen association, in the case of George Morris. *See Semple's hist., pp.* 143-147.

But brethren, these discrepancies and violations do not by any means fill up the measure of your design. Not satisfied with having violated the constitution of your body, and infringed the rights of several of your churches, as if infatuated by your anticipated triumph, you present yourselves in formal array before the remaining churches of the association, in the most positive, and we presume, unauthorized (by the churches) language, saying, "nor can they (the association) in future act in concert with delegates from any church or churches, that may encourage or countenance their ministrations."

What an assumption of authority is this! It is a tone that might be justified in a guardian or parent, but surely, not in a Baptist association. We conceive that this restriction is directly at variance with a permission of the Holy Spirit, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." You say that the Baptist churches shall not exercise their rights, in hearing and judging of the pretensions of certain individuals, without the risk of being rejected from your assembly! Can it be possible that the freemen of fifty Virginia Baptist churches, will yield to such ecclesiastical, or rather, clerical domination? And what is it that you so much fear and so strongly deprecate? Can you think that an intelligent public, or enlightened body of christians, will confide in you, when you tell them, without the force of either argument or evidence to sustain you, that it is "*heresy! heresy!*" in all its destructive enormity? Will you not be justly reminded, that truth is mighty, and has nothing to fear from error, while we enjoy the privilege of free and fair debate?

Digitized by Google

Why resort to coercive measures, in immediate connection with the lofty expression of your *numerous refutations*, so easily accomplished? Will not the public and the churches think as well of these things as yourselves, and so be willing to dispense with the sanctions of *illegitimate* authority? Rely upon it, brethren, there is something wrong in this matter. The public seem at least as dull in comprehending your refutations, as you are in understanding us. Your course is an insult upon the intelligence of the people. If we proceeded as you represent, the very lowest orders of society would reject us with disdain; leaving you no cause for alarm, either on your own or their account; for you say that we teach "*contrary* to the plain letter and spirit of the New Testament," upon all the leading principles, or more conspicuous features of the christian institution. But how "contrary," your "reporter" saith not, preferring that the world should have full latitude for condemning us rather for what we do not, than for what we do say. So the public are to be led to *think* that they *believe*, (without evidence or argument,) that we teach, that *sin* is no evil, and does no harm; that *faith* is something different from believing what God, Christ, the prophets and apostles have said to us in the Bible; that *repentance* is not sorrow for sin; that *regeneration* has nothing to do with the heart; that baptism is a mere "*bodily act*" of small importance, and may be attended to or not, without at all affecting our claims upon the promises of God to the obedient; that the *work of the spirit* is not essential to the production of a new creature, &c. &c. All this the people may believe if they please; you have given all latitude. By not candidly showing in what degree we teach contrary to the word of God, you leave the public to conclude that we are inculcating some mere system of immorality. A candid reader of your report, considering its assertions to be evidence, would be surprised to find that we ever entered into the "Divine Arcanum" far enough, to cull here and there a "scrap," even for sound, much less for sense; so exceedingly perverse are you in your course. But the sequel will set forth some of the things taught by us.

4. You have attempted to bring public odium upon, and to excite the fears of the religious and irreligious towards individuals, by an unwarrantable attack upon their moral character, without adducing evidence to sustain your vague and groundless charges. We are held up as bad men, and the public warned against us as propagators of sentiments whose tendency is disorganizing among the churches, and "demoralizing" "in society in general," if we have not misunderstood the words of the report. The course pursued here is strikingly like that of the Pharisees who sought of Pilate the condemnation of the Saviour. Waiting in vain for charge and evidence, the governor condescended to leave his seat and hall, and make the needed enquiry of those who had deemed it unnecessary to prepare either. And what must now be done? Either their simple declaration, with the supposition that they were too good and too wise to have condemned him themselves, or arrested him, must be received, or witnesses must be suborned to carry their point. "If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee." "Pilate, he is a malefactor, *we* have no doubt of it, and you ought not to expect us to prove it. We are the most pious of the religious, the true worshippers of the only true God; we insist upon it: crucify him! crucify him!"

Now brethren, we call upon you to produce your evidence that we have either collectively or individually disorganized one church in this or any other association. No case existing, you would avoid a pointed declaration by resorting to other phraseology, imputing to our views a certain "*tendency*." But will this become a more potent apology for your strong measures? Surely not. Your dilemma is a hundred fold, if possible, increased by it. Condemn and expose men on account of the "*tendency*," not actual results, of their sentiments. Being constrained to admit that your former list of churches is still complete, and not one of them destroyed, broken up, or disorganized by us; but still bent on our destruction, you say by your course to us, "though you have not done thus, we apprehend that you may hereafter do it, the 'tendency' of your views leans that way; as we cannot therefore condemn you in this way for what you have done, we are resolved to do it for what you may hereafter do, what you have not done." This is the practical consummation of the doctrine which was first proposed among you about twelve months ago. Its author possesses eminent qualifications, and would probably relieve you from a portion of your present embarrassment, and gratify us by favouring the public with a treatise upon the *ethics*, *logic* and *divinity* of the doctrine, "that men should be condemned for *what they do not say*, though they be praiseworthy or blameless for what *they do*

Digitized by Google

say." But we would again call upon you for proof of your charge. You say that you had waited long "to witness their *practical*, [Walker says, relating to *action* not *speculative*,] influence upon the churches;" we suppose the *actual* effects of our course, and perceived "by their *practical* influence, churches long blessed with peace and prosperity, have been thrown into wrangling and discord." This seems to be your own interpretation of your language. And is this the meaning of "disorganizing?" Will any lexicographer on earth sustain you in your definition? Will an enlightened public yield to such a perversion of language? Or will you persist in it without the support of facts in point? The churches *wrangled*, and your "*best* and most *enlightened* men that ever *lived* or *died*," have been reminded that they had not exceeded Paul in perfection, nor become too wise to err. These things offended the good and the wise, and you are pleased to call this "*disorganizing*," without either breaking up or otherwise destroying.

As to your second, associated item, we are willing not only to appeal to the congregations to which we respectively belong, but to "society in general," for the truth. Subjoined to this address is one from the Lower College church to you, setting forth the effects of the course of one of us particularly, with allusion likewise to the rest of us. We will not ask a *prayerful*, but only a *careful* reading of that address. That church comprises near a thousand members, and we humbly presume to think, stands highly worthy of your attention. You are by her fairly met and formally *refuted* in a different manner from that in which your "reporter" leads you to say "has been often done" to us; as widely different as the difference between "stubborn facts" and empty sounds. That church has omitted the notice of one exception however, in which we are forced, painful as it may be, to admit the *truth* of your charge by pleading *guilty*. And but for the fact, that far better beings than we could ever imagine ourselves to be, have produced at least as great evils before us, we might possibly be overwhelmed by the combined operation of your charge and our conviction. The Saviour and his apostles produced by their course the most immoral effects, and *whence* they ought least to have been anticipated, for they were among their *professed friends*, *brethren*, and the *avowed worshippers* of God. From a like source only have we perceived from our course immoral or "demoralizing" effects to any extent. Lamentable indeed have been these effects! and greatly to be deplored by all the lovers of truth, holiness and peace. But are we to be made answerable for the misunderstandings and misrepresentations of those who might easily be informed if they pleased, and correctly state if they chose, the matters in controversy among us? And above all, are we to be blamed for their *misdoings?* We trust not.

Your "reporter" makes you say, and it is no small thing, that "it is needless to specify and refute the errors held and taught by them; this has been often done, and as often have the doctrines quoted from their writings been denied, with the declaration that they are misrepresented or misunderstood." Now brethren, we appeal to you before Him in whose presence we shall all shortly have to stand to render up our accounts, to say whether your "reporter" has not grievously misled you here? Have you brethren, one and all, seen and clearly understood the refutations which you are thus made to assert? Are you well persuaded that what you have seen, presented a fair exhibition of our views? If not, have you not been too precipitate in putting forth this assertion? Would it not have been better to wait till another meeting of your body, and cause us to appear there for proper explanation? Does not the spirit of truth and love dictate such a course? Some of you have seen what the King & Queen conference of January, 1830, set forth as "*Campbellism*," and probably think that the items there specified embrace the views inculcated by us. If so, permit us to assure you that nothing need be more foreign to the truth; we have never met with man or woman who advocated those views. But again:

Your "reporter" leads you to say, likewise, that "their views of sin, faith, repentance, regeneration, baptism, the agency of the Holy Spirit, church government, the christian ministry, and the whole scheme of christian benevolence, are, we believe, contrary to the plain letter and spirit of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour." You say, you *believe* all these things: but nothing can be *believed* without *testimony*, and we can perceive nothing like testimony in the affair; nay, it is evidently excluded in the beginning of the same paragraph, it being then deemed needless to specify even the errors, much less the evidence. But, forsooth, the errors *do* appear before another sentence is begun, in their true nakedness, unsup-

Digitized by Google

ported by any thing more than the assertion of a fallible mortal. And could your witness have been cross-examined, his incompetency would have been readily detected; his information being limited rather to *what we do not say and do*, than extended to our actual course. The testimony of such a witness is worth nothing in any case, beyond its negative effect. No man can be condemned upon such evidence. But farther: You know that it is contrary to propriety, and the common course of justice, to pass any judgment without having fairly heard both sides of the question; and if the present order could be reversed, we have no doubt you would say of us, that without hearing both sides, we *could have no right* to condemn either; for, in matters of this kind, right of judgment in a third party can only be properly founded upon a dispassionate examination of respective claims.

Since, in this besom of destruction, you have neither given your own views, which might have guided the public in the present mazy sate,—the teaching of the scripture,—nor the views so wickedly propagated by us; it may not be amiss for us to glance at the list, by embodying a few of those things which we generally teach as circumstances suggest, under the respective heads enumerated.

And first of Sin. This, we teach, is the transgression of law; that all unrighteousness is sin; that it originated in the garden of Eden, by the seduction of the serpent, under satanic influence; that our first parents having transgressed the law of God, concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, sin entered into the world, with its tragical consequences in its train, the last enemy, death, being included—death, spiritual, temporal and eternal; that we are all by nature the children of wrath, and as prone to sin as sparks are to ascend; that without obtaining the pardon of our actual sins through the blood of Christ, we must be lost forever; that in a state of favour, as presented in the Gospel, we may expect trials and difficulties, and will have to struggle strongly for such measures of grace as our wants are sure to require; that though we are divinely assured, that in the path of duty "sin shall not have dominion" over us, we are still admonished to be most watchful of its inroads, and to guard daily against its deathful influence; in a word, we endeavour to inculcate all that the Holy Spirit has dictated upon this important point, as we happen to meet His instructions upon the sacred page.

2. *Faith.* As we teach upon the foregoing item, that where there is no law imposed, there can be no actual sin charged, so under this head, we teach, that where there is no testimony, there can be no faith;—(and we might well add, that where there are no facts, there can be no testimony)—that human testimony upon earthly subjects, can only produce human faith, while divine testimony upon all subjects produces divine faith; that it is beyond the power of the human mind to comprehend things more to be desired, or more to be feared, than the things described in the sacred record; that the christian faith embraces, and is limited to the things thus set forth; that it is derived from this source by being read or heard; that faith from any other source, or by other means, is spurious and not saving; that the Saviour and Holy Spirit justify this conclusion thus: "neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall *believe* on me through their *word*;" "how then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not *heard?* and how shall they *hear* without a preacher?"—"So then, *faith* cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the *word* of God." "Who hath *believed* our *report?*" Farther, that to believe with the heart, or sincerely, the things written by the evangelists and apostles, legitimately, and very uniformly leads to a striking change in the views of the subject, and to an exercise of your third item.

3. *Repentance.* Upon this subject, we teach, that repentance towards God, is sorrow for having sinned against God; that God "now commandeth all men every where to repent: because He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained;" with many other warnings of the same sort, from the same source. Moreover, that repentance for having done wrong is consummated or perfected, when it has wrought a *reformation of life* as its *fruit*. That one among the numerous effects of repentance unto a reformation of life, is, through faith a *full and final* surrender of the creature to God, *mentally*, which surrender is frequently accompanied by strong emotions of gratitude, peace and joy, thus evincing that change of heart, which we humbly conceive, answers to your idea of *regeneration*. Which is, what we consider, the being under the divine influence; impregnated by the word of God; in a word, to realize the truth of what Paul says upon this subject, "that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit." You see that we do not deny the ex-

Digitized by Google

istence, nor absolute necessity of the *existence of the thing*, but only insist that you have not applied the term *regeneration* as the Holy Spirit applied it. The heart must be changed, or the subject cannot be saved. But wishing to be as fully understood as practicable, under existing circumstances, we will state that by the scriptures, we are led to teach, that "the world cannot receive the spirit of truth;" consequently, that no special gift of the spirit can be necessary to the production of faith; but "as many as *received* Him, [Christ,] to them gave He power to become the sons of God." That the "work of the spirit" is something different from, and pre-requisite to, the "gift of the spirit," promised by Peter on the day of Pentecost. As some have been inclined to be sarcastic upon us, as to this point, demanding of us how the spirit was received and recognized in holy baptism, we would answer such, by reminding them, that spiritual things, many of them, and particularly this one, are not susceptible of occular demonstration, but, as in natural, so in spiritual things, when we cannot find data by which to reason from cause to effect, we reason from effect to cause; and feel authorized to say, that as "many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God;" that by the fruit of the spirit, assurance is afforded to our own minds, and evidence to others, without which, neither ourselves nor the world can possibly have reason to think, that the Holy Spirit has constituted us its temple. If our brethren have been favored with more extraordinary manifestations of the spirit, happy are they, and more happy should we be, could we but perceive them. But let Paul settle this matter, while we honestly consider and apply his words. We said by the effects, or fruit, we must learn whether we have ever received the spirit, or are now under His influence. By contrast, deformity and beauty, error and truth, vice and virtue, are rendered more striking. "Now," says the apostle Paul, "the works of the *flesh* are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, *hatred*, *variance*, *emulations*, *wrath*, *strife*, seditions, *heresies*, *envyings*, murders," &c. "But the fruit of the spirit is LOVE, [please read the 13th ch., 1st Cor., by way of commentary,] joy, *peace*, *long-suffering*, *gentleness*, *goodness*, *faith*, *meekness*, *temperance*." And lastly, upon this point, we are compelled to say, that if we have not the "spirit of Christ, we are none of his." But to return to the first stage of the agency of the Holy Spirit, as preliminary to immersion:

The present salvation of the sinner, the end of this stage of the work of the spirit we teach, is not yet to be considered accomplished, unless we would venture to resist or grieve the spirit. We must not only believe, repent, reform, be grateful, happy, experience more or less peace, or rejoice, but be immersed into Christ, "for the remission of sins," as God's instituted mean of rendering to the obedient a full and gracious acquittal from the guilt and condemnation resulting from all past disobedience, thus realizing what the apostle Paul means by "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy spirit." We teach that now we may expect to enjoy the unutterable comfort of the promised spirit, provided we walk by faith, and not attempt vainly to do so by sight; and that without these great preliminaries we are not authorized to consider any man within the pale of the kingdom, nor consequently qualified to take part in the government and ordinances of God's house on earth.

Thus brethren, have we briefly glanced at your enumeration of our crimes, down to "church government," the "christian ministry," and "benevolent institutions." We need add but few words here. It is our duty however to disabuse the public upon these as well as other matters. The government of the church of Christ, we conceive to be specified in the New Testament. We there find that all immersed believers who walk according to that rule of faith and practice, are under the divine benediction; that for the more convenient and suitable administration of the government of the body, two descriptions of officers or servants are authorized, to wit: those called "servants," "elders," "bishops," or "overseers," and "deacons." All necessary rules and regulations are suitably prepared or provided, and perfectly, according to the form of sound words, presented in this sacred book, admitting neither of alteration nor amendment, subtraction nor addition. That any rule for any purpose whatever in the government of the church, to be added by a church, though it be for its own exclusive use, is an infringement of the divine prerogative, and sinful. The fact that such rule is not comprised in the New Testament, proves it to be a human addition, and stamps it with the most solemn and awful condemnation of the head of the church. The business of a church in this particular, seems to be, to learn the laws already written, and to act, and require action in obedience

Digitized by Google

thereto. We teach that a congregation of male christians ought never to be considered "destitute," merely because none of its members are able to speak agreeably to the public; but on the contrary, that all such, are called to be "kings and priests" to God, and should not fail, with the will of the body, to keep up the observance of the ordinances regularly.

As to the "ministry," we would say, we would to Heaven that their number was increased—their morals were improved—their gifts were more exalted—their knowledge was more extensive—their zeal was more burning—their labours were to the ends of the earth—and their success in turning men to holiness, righteousness and peace, was a thousand fold increased! Yet more: we would have them paid for their trouble in dollars and cents according to the gospel, but more abundantly, in souls, for their hire. Brethren of the ministry, think not that we do not wish you to work, or to be paid for your work, or that we desire to thrust you from your present elevated seats that we might become the miserable occupants: such are not our feelings or design, in pursuing the course we do. But we perceived (or thought so) that you had taken higher seats (which you know is *quite natural*, in other words *carnal*, and very early in the christian history was manifested as you will recollect in the case of the mother of Zebedee's children, and among others, by the question, "who is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven?") than the great master of ceremonies had designed, and assumed more of divine authority than the credentials presented seemed to sustain. We first doubted, then disbelieved, and lastly, opposed such pretensions. We have long felt the influence of your ill-will thus incurred. But what alternative was left? We found ourselves under the most imperious obligations to dissent from you, and impelled by motives not less weighty to proclaim that dissent. It is unnecessary to dwell here, and will only remark, that the interests, the very best interests of our fellow-creatures, forced us to oppose you in different particulars. While we have endeavoured to lower you to the proper level of christianity, we have laboured earnestly to elevate our brethren at large, to a due sense of their rights, privileges and exalted calling. We trust, that if we have in doing thus, sinned, that we shall yet feel it, repent of it, reform and find forgiveness by that confession which exhibits one of the most exalted features of the holy institution.

Upon the subject of the "benevolent institutions," we shall say but very little. A large number of the public are already entirely informed. Some of us happen to be members of bible and temperance societies, all friendly to Sunday schools, and none opposed, as far as we can be convinced, to any object of pursuit set forth in the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour. Brethren, what more would you have us to say, to be, or to do?

Having thus reviewed your design and means of proving us bad men, whose course "ought to be disavowed and resisted, by all the lovers of truth and sound piety," who, "while they arrogate to themselves the title of 'reformers,' it is lamentably evident, that no sect in christendom needs reformation more than they do," we shall proceed

5. Lastly, to show that you have done violence to the clearly revealed will of the King of Zion, by lopping from the body of Christ, members who have been neither fairly heard by you, nor condemned by the scriptures. This deduction is based upon facts most notorious. As before stated, the writer of this article in '31, made a defence at Bruington, of doctrinal views, and of his practice upon the subject of the Gospel. A very large number of persons attended; among whom, were many of our Baptist brethren, including particularly, elders Semple and Broaddus. It is well known, that the design animating these brethren on that occasion, was, to introduce upon the *pages of the church book*, seven resolutions, (not found, of course, in the New Testament,) for the purpose of arresting him in his course. But it pleased God to foil them in this design, by leading the church to *reject* the resolutions, thus formally proposed by the King & Queen conference. Now, be it remarked, that the writer was then a member of Bruington church, and needed only to commit an immoral act in his private or public deportment, known to the church, to insure to him a *certain and speedy exclusion*. But on that memorable occasion, no charge of immorality was preferred; no scripture violations adduced. So far from this, with all the inveteracy of mortification that could be imagined, elder Broaddus confessed, as before stated, that there was but little difference between the writer and himself, while elder Semple must, in all probability, have perceived, that the ground defended was fairly tenable, the *scriptures* being

Digitized by Google

the standard. These facts being notorious, by no means confined to a corner, we conceive ourselves justifiable in the charge alleged, that we have not been fairly heard by you, nor condemned by the word of God; consequently, that you have done violence to the scriptures by your course. But all this high-handed dealing, would seem to be clothed in the hallowed garb of *prayerful deliberation*. How awfully must you here be misled! The "reporter" causes you to say, "after having *deliberately* and *prayerfully* examined the doctrines held," et cetera.

Brethren, can these things be so? All the delegates of the Dover association who have aided in this work, did *deliberately* and *prayerfully* examine the doctrines! O religion! O virtue! whither art thou fled? Where is that sacred, holy, high-minded, unyielding integrity, christian love and honour, which will ever "render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and to God that which is God's?" Can you for a moment think brethren, that the profane, thread-bare garb of *human expediency*, will hide the nakedness of such deformities in that great day to which we hasten? Men, in their best earthly condition, are still human, and ever liable to err; to mislead, and to be misled. How can we look at this subject, but with the most solemn impressions? Will you reply, that deliberative bodies possess peculiar latitude in framing and setting forth their acts? This could avail nothing in your case, unless you can shew precept or example upon the sacred page, authorizing christians to assert what they know little or nothing about, to believe what is not properly authenticated, or to say that they have done most solemnly and piously, what they have *never done at all!* You had much to do, before you could properly join elder Kerr, in this report. The very words which he puts into your mouth, *if not expressive of the facts in each case*, were themselves an insuperable barrier to your union with him. How could it be otherwise? Judging the general body of your delegates, including ministers, by those with whom we are personally or otherwise acquainted, we feel authorized to say, that not one in every ten, nay, not one in every twenty of the whole number opposed to the reformation, could give even a tolerable exhibition of the views contended for by us. Though many of them are abundantly intelligent in other matters, upon this subject they are marvellously ignorant, as their unnumbered mistakes and misrepresentations shew. And this ignorance is the result of their own course; and should have sealed the lips of such of them as took part in this matter, with "hermetical" precision. They remind us of Dr. A. Clarke's account of a flourishing and bombastic young infidel. After having said much, derogatory to the claims of christianity, the doctor asked him, if he had read attentively, a certain chapter of one of the evangelists. "No," replied the young gentleman, "I did not know that there was such a chapter." Many among us, oppose the reformation, at least as ignorantly. They will not read what we write, and have become acquainted with but little of what we say. So ignorant are a great many upon the subjects embraced by the reformation, that if one will let them know that he dislikes Campbell, speak a little evil of the reformers, take care not to be *called* one, (for *names* are almost as weighty with some, as religion itself) and say nothing about baptism for remission of sins, he may teach and preach every thing besides, that we do; even the propriety of meeting every Lord's day, with, or without a preacher, reading the scriptures, making prayers and exhortation, which gets almost into the "ancient order" itself, without being detected or blamed. Such is the state of things in this quarter. But to return: You said that you had prayerfully and deliberately examined the doctrines. Your examination we may suppose, was of a comparative nature; the facts as we stated them (not their misrepresentations) in one hand, and the scriptures in the other, while the soul was lifted up to God for guidance in this momentous work. Under such circumstances it will not be considered indecorous or presumptuous in the writer, to address to such *humble*, *zealous* and *pious* spirits, a few queries. As an aggrieved party, he would ask, have you ever, with the bible in your hands, carefully read and compared in an unbroken connection, the writings of A. Campbell, from the beginning of the Christian Baptist down to the 9th number of the 3d volume of the Harbinger? Or so much of, and such parts of these works as to enable you at the time of this declaration, to state distinctly what is therein taught? But Campbell out of the question: could you in the sight of God at the time alluded to, state explicitly the views taught, as they think, according to the scriptures, by the writer, and others cut off from your body? If these enquiries must be answered in the negative, what must an intelligent and virtuous people think, or what must the searcher of hearts think of your course? But you say it was *prayerfully* done, and would have the world to conclude that it must be *right*-

Digitized by Google

eously done of course. But all actions connected with prayer, even sincere, fervent prayer, are not necessarily right: and we are exceedingly prone to err in what we consider answers to prayer. It is worthy of note, that there is no answer to prayer which men will so eagerly embrace, as that which they are particularly anxious to accomplish, or obtain, as the case may be, before they commence the exercise. Upon this subject, we may farther briefly add, that all answers to prayer for temporal or spiritual guidance must be drawn, either from God's book of *providence*, if we may use the terms, or his book of *inspiration*. Now it so happens, that your prayer was fully answered by the last source; but in your hurry and confusion, you overlooked it; or rather preferred if you saw it, to draw it from another source, under sanctions not to be envied. If we are not greatly mistaken, the report to which you affixed your authority, and which has involved you in the most irreligious and serious predicament, was written some weeks before you met in association; the contents of which, not being known to many of you until the very moment of decision. If these things be so, it will be admitted by you, that the "reporter" has taken you unawares, and led you to say, that you had done that which you never did. At best, we see through a glass darkly; but how much more apt are we to fall into ditches, when we suffer men to blind-fold us, and afterwards attempt to follow *them* whithersoever they shall say is the way. Circumstances seem to say, that you prayed, that your prepared plan (leaving out all examinations) might not be defeated, rather than, that the Lord might guide you into the way of righteousness, unity and peace. It is not surprising then, that you mistook the true answer. The living oracle must be our guide in all religious concerns appertaining to the house of God. There we learn what we must, and what we must not do. While we pray to him for guidance, we must look to that for his answers. Impulses, sounds and providential circumstances are ever ready to deceive, but the entrance of God's words giveth light. With these views of your course, brethren, we shall now close by a brief summary of what the word of God seems to oppose to your course, inferring assuredly, that you have done violence to his will concerning the government of his people on earth. *You have proceeded, and we stand upon the supposition, that we are christians.* Here we will test the final merits of your course.

Men, in any number, or of any standing, can never, without divine authority, which describes cases and prescribes courses, rightfully dissolve the intimate connexion of the members of Christ's body. See the xii. ch., 1st Cor., beginning at the 14th verse: "For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, [in a good, nor ill humour,] I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more, those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary: And those members of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need: but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked: That there should be no *schism* in the body; *but that the members should have the same care one for another.* And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now, ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular."

Here, we find, that envy or any other evil passion is to be discountenanced, and our respective places of membership humbly and affectionately cultivated, no matter who may be more exalted than ourselves. And, as on the one hand, we are not to be disparaged by those above us, we are expressly forbidden to despise those below us. We are not allowed to be looking up uncomely, or any other sort of members, for the exercise of authority, without just cause. But what a striking contrast do you present! Your course seems to the writer, to present the case of a man who finds fault of his feet; not because they are paralytic, ulcerated, or mortified, but simply because they are willing and labouring, to bear him with increasing speed, to that home, where all the faculties of the soul will be absorbed in the un

Digitized by Google

utterable fruition of celestial bliss, surrounded by the companions of his labours, and participants of his joys. How inconsistent and utterly transgressive of the spirit and letter of the christian religion, are your proceedings! Again, in the 1st ch. of the same epistle, the apostle writes, "now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no *divisions* among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." And to the Ephesians, he writes, "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all *lowliness and meekness*, [the very opposite of *ambition*, *pride* and *self*, the apparent sources of your present *motives*, *means and ends*,] with *long-suffering*, *forbearing* one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." "There is one body." Jesus saith, according to John, "neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: [mark it reader,] *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*"

Now, brethren, if you can read the few quotations above, as they fairly stand in their respective connections, to which many more might be added, and not be forced to admit, that you have assumed undue authority, and distinctly, in several points, transgressed God's law as fairly laid down for the preservation of the unity, peace, prosperity, and operation upon the world, of the *body* of Christ; we say, if you can do otherwise than admit the fact, we, on our part, must confess that truth, though frequently mighty, in razing the strong holds of the enemy, will occasionally meet with impregnable barriers among her professed advocates.

It will be unnecessary to multiply extravagantly the items of your transgressions; and having, as we think, fairly shown that *the law of christian unity*, both as to *body* and *spirit* has been trampled under your feet; the Lord saying, "there is one body;" you saying, there shall be *two bodies*—the Lord saying, there is but "one spirit;" you saying, we shall not be recognized hereafter as partakers of that spirit—He says, we must speak the same things; while you strive to make us speak things different—He says, there must be no *divisions*, but that we must be "joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment;" while you say it is absolutely necessary for us to divide, and be opposed both in mind and judgment, et cetera, we shall only add, that you have as grossly transgressed the *law of love*.

In the execution of this duty, the writer will be brief. Please read the foregoing part of the xiii. ch., 1st Cor., as a corrective to our self-delusions, and then a description of christian love personified, beginning in the fourth verse: "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not her own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things; believeth all things; hopeth all things; endureth all things; chairity never faileth." Here are sixteen points descriptive of this heavenly principle; *fourteen* of which, the writer thinks, you have utterly contemned. Leo's course towards Luther, circumstances fairly considered, with this law of God before you, most clearly throws you into the back-ground. Paul says to the Hebrews, "let brotherly love continue." Peter says, "add to your faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, *brotherly kindness*, and charity." Are you not utterly contrary to these inspired men? Many, under your influence, are now making the most violent efforts for the final destruction of the last remains of that love of which the apostles thus wrote. Men who used to love us with all the ardour becoming them, are now learning to cultivate every unkind feeling, meet us with the cold *Sir!* or more unchristian *Mister!* Those who used to think that all *upright, immersed believers*, were proper subjects of christian fellowship, and endearing communion around the table of our common Lord, are now holding themselves aloof, and waiting, as we may suppose, for some *new* argument from some human source, to sustain them, not only against their uniform and long-established usage, but the known will of the King of Zion. Must not brotherly kindness, christian love, perish among us? As certainly, as that God's word is despised by such as are now pursuing this course. And is not the *law of christian love*, viewed in any aspect whatever, most clearly transgressed by your proceedings." But there is a spirit of action set forth in the New Testament, which seems, to the writer, to be strikingly descriptive of that manifested by yourselves; and having shewn with what your course is entirely *incompatible*, we will endeavor to point out that with which it is

Digitized by Google

fully consistent, as presented in the sacred oracle for our instruction. You are doubtless, very zealously disposed towards the Lord, and having identified the traditions of your fathers with divine authority itself, feel authorized to go the length you have ventured, forgetting that the Lord's *will* can never be executed but according to his *word*. You are right in being zealous, but wrong in its application. So it was with Peter. He loved his master and was zealous in his cause; but withal possessed and indulged a mischievous and anti-christian spirit, when the cause of truth, *humanly judging*, (as you have done,) was endangered by the final betrayal of his master. You will recollect that he resorted to strong measures, and cut off the ear of Malchus. But the Lord rebuked him, touched and healed the wounded. He was not willing you see, to leave the cause to the management of its great author; not being able to see how truth could prosper under such embarrassments. Is not this, brethren, your real spirit? You will cut off members, and if need be, why not literally ears, too? On another occasion, when the Saviour was refused admittance into a village, the disciples proposed to call down fire and burn them up. But the Lord said nay; though they, much above yourselves, pleaded an example as afforded by the course of Elijah, which they thought in point. The parable of the tares, xiii. ch. Math., presents another illustration of your spirit.

Brethren, it behooves us to try the spirits. "Believe not every spirit; because many false prophets are gone out into the world," who will do almost any thing to maintain their reputation, which now totters to its fall. Men who think they have to lose all, and gain nothing, are sure to make strong struggles in the day of desperation. All spirits which confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and is still upon his throne, and teach us unqualified submission to him only, as the king eternal, invisible, immortal, the only wise God, are to be regarded as of God; to whom be glory forever!

Thus have we reviewed the report of the Dover association, with reference to its most important contents. We should say a few words however, in relation to the items specified in the latter part of the report, which represent that the persons cut off, "have voluntarily assumed the name of 'reformers,' in its party application, by attending a meeting publicly advertised for that party; and by communing with, and otherwise promoting the views of the members of that party, who have been separated from the fellowship and communion of regular baptist churches." Is this your ground brethren? Is this the process by which regular baptists become reformers? If so, there must be quite a multitude of us. And why not cut off the rest? As the six cut-off members, derived their name from the Mangohick and Essex meetings, one of which, some member of the church probably *advertised*, (what a presumptuous being, thus to infringe the rights of our regular brethren!) and possibly without leave of your moderator who was formerly pastor there; we ask, as these six obtained their name thus, how did the party spoken of, get its name? Aye! on looking at the report we see how, and where they got their name, under this cover; "who," (that party) "have been separated from the fellowship and communion of regular baptist churches." This is a grave slander and should be briefly noticed. To a distant reader it would appear, that the reformers within the borders of the Dover association at least, were nothing more nor less than a body of men separated from regular baptist churches. They have been put out, because they were not fit to stay in, of course; but exactly for what they have been put out, the "reporter" thought it best not to tell. The reader is led to believe that the party, and certainly the party means the whole party, have been "separated" from the different churches to which they belonged! The writer will not add the title justly merited by this misrepresentation; it would be a work of supererogation. It constitutes the last and top stone of this wicked device—this worse than baseless fabric. Let the public have the facts. We may venture to say, that within the compass of the association, not more than from ten to twenty members have ever been excluded or separated on account of their reformation sentiments. Nay, the writer thinks that nearly the whole number so treated, appertained to Piscataway church in Essex alone; from which church, *upon the advice of the minister*, *mark it reader!* added to their own inclination, *nine* persons if our memory is correct, *withdrew!* Please note the difference between *withdrawing* and being "*separated*" from the churches. These members withdrew, (who would have been retained if they had pleased) much to the provocation of the pastor, who, *some weeks* afterwards, prepared a formal bull of excommunication, and had it *voted into force* for the gratification of his ill-humour. You can hardly study this old gentleman's character,

Digitized by Google

thout thinking of Diotrephes. He is not without a precedent then; and as it is one found in scripture, he may think it the more worthy of emulation. But to return: these are the members alluded to as "separated," and who would seem to constitute the bone and sinew of the reformation. Every feature of the report is monstrous; manifesting a temper and disposition, reckless of those high obligations imposed by our holy religion. The last mentioned feature of the report, has been particularly adverted to by the writer, with the design, not only to expose its sophistry, but likewise to wrest from obloquy and reproach the good name of men and women whose deportment entitles them to the respect and affection of all who regard the christian character. And what brethren would you gain by accomplishing your wish to degrade us?

> "He who steals from me my purse, steals trash:
> 'Twas mine—'tis his:
> And has been slave to thousands.
> But he who filches from me my good name,
> Robs me of that, which not enriches him;
> But makes me poor indeed."

To rob these respectable christians of their good name, and through them, to render us odious in the sight of the public, is your most apparent design. Should it be found necessary, ample documents will be laid before the public in justification of what the writer has here said concerning the treatment of these members.

In conclusion, the writer will remark, that he feels confident that many of the delegates who sustained elder Kerr's report, did so hastily, without fully appreciating its glaring enormities: he has written to all however as he was compelled to do, not knowing how to discriminate. Some five or ten of the *ministers* (see how well marked the distinction is, between the "*ministers* and *delegates*." Are the ministers not delegates? "Aye," as the moderator would probably say, "but the delegates are not *ministers!!*" very true!) we say, some five or ten of the ministers have brought us into all this strife and its attendant evils. When *they* become reconciled to the good old way, we shall again harmonize and be happy.

Notwithstanding all that the writer has hitherto written, said or done, with too much severity, as many will think, manifesting bitterness of spirit; in the fear of God, he can still say, that he loves his christian brethren in every house and every rank; can forgive with unspeakable cheerfulness, all those who have designed to injure him; and feels confident that there was no *real, unavoidable* necessity for a separation in the baptist ranks; nay, that we must, he thinks, sooner or later be reunited. This last sentiment he cherishes most tenderly, and would recommend to all, whether for, or against the reformation, no matter what may be their trials and difficulties—nor how many hard things they may be forced to think, say or do towards their brethren for a season, still to keep in mind the fact, that there is but "*one body*," for whose *unity* it is, as the polar star to our exertions, we are eternally bound to strive.

"Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you." "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."

J. DU-VAL.

KING WILLIAM, Nov. 1832.

The following is a copy of the proceedings of the Lower College church, in reference to the course of the late Dover association:

To the Delegates of the late Dover Association:

BRETHREN—From a decision of the last Dover association, as appearing in the Religious Herald, Lower College church, among others, would seem to occupy a painful, and indeed, a peculiar attitude. With sorrow, she there learns, that some of her brethren, who have been for days and years gone by, labouring to promote the religion of Jesus; whose supreme desire is to live in perfect love and obedience to him, and to teach and persuade men so; these disciples, she finds, are represented

Digitized by Google

by her brethren, and denounced, as being totally irreligious, and propagators of false doctrine; producing in society the most pernicious effects, wherever they are heard, and so being unworthy of *their* fellowship, (and even of the countenance of the world.) Among this little group of "demoralizers," is recorded the name of her pastor, John Du-Val.

This calls upon the church to consider her condition, look to her duty, and to have regard to her interest; in the performance of which, she views herself as driven to this alternative: either to renounce him who has loved and comforted her; or, with him, to be cut off and thrust out from their communion. This is what the church considers herself called upon to decide, and which, in the fear of God, she has decided, desiring at all times to act in his fear, and for his glory. Whereupon, on the 4th Lord's day in October last, at Acquintain church, brother Du-Val read from the pulpit to the congregation, the document alluded to, and after making a few remarks in reference thereto, in the spirit of his master, appealed to the church, whether, in her estimation, he merited the imputations laid to him by the association, and whether they desired a discontinuance of his labours, declaring at the same time, that it was foreign to his wish to press or intrude himself upon any occasion, and if there was a small minority even, who wished him to discontinue his labours, he would unhesitatingly do so. Upon which a vote was taken, and the church was unanimous for retaining him. Thus the church has felt it incumbent upon her, to notice the course assumed by her brethren. She must say, that she does not approbate their dealings towards those brethren they have expelled, and publicly calumniated. Nor can she abandon her beloved brother, who, when he heard her cry, and saw her almost deserted condition, passed her not by, but came to her and rendered that assistance which she so much needed; who, having enlisted under the banner of the Great King, and having on the whole armour of God, lent his aid to help her on to her God, determined "to know nothing but Jesus and him crucified." In the discharge of his duty, he has taught many the way of salvation, and persuaded many to flee the wrath to come, and to lay hold on the hope set before them; for which, he is held near and dear to the church, as the gift of God. Yes, she loves him with the tenderest affection, and will never cease to love him, whilst he continues a lover of the doctrine of Christ and his apostles.

The church would, in the spirit of meekness, make some enquiries of her brethren. Have you been with our brother, and have you heard him? If not, will you condemn him unheard? But if you have known and have heard him, will you in the presence of the searcher of hearts, after so much "prayerful deliberation," promulgate to the world that he is a false teacher, and one among the most impious of men? This is a hard sentence. Brethren, we would have you think of this. There is nothing more true, as you have said to us, than that we need reformation. This is what we seek after, being conscious that we are poor and needy. But God who is plenteous in mercy, hath declared that they who love and obey him, he will never leave nor forsake. This is our hope and our comfort. And that we may fight the good fight of faith, and come off conquerors and more than conquerors through him that loved us, is the prayer of

Signed, *By order of the church,* { THOS. T. NEALE, JAS. B. EDWARDS, } *Clerks.*

3

Furnished reading this volume of Sept 5, 1915

J. B. Briney

Digitized by Google